

VOLUME 30 - No. 7

Recd. M.M. Kilpatrick Dec 23
469 S. 2nd St.,
8) San Jose, Calif.

JULY, 1924

*Continues The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's Assistant,
Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Illustrator.*

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

ESTABLISHED IN 1889

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS—David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D. William H. Bates, D.D.
Leander S. Keyser, D.D. David S. Kennedy, D.D.

Contributing Editors—W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Dyson Hague, D.D., William Phillips Hall,
Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D., LL.D., L. Franklin Gruber, D.D., LL.D., A. William Lewis, D.D.,
H. W. Bromley, D.D., W. E. Biederwolf, D.D., John Roach Straton, D.D., W. B. Riley, D.D.,
Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., William M. McPheeters, D.D., Charles Calvert Ellis, B.D., Ph.D.,
J. L. Dickens, D.D., LL.D., Bishop William F. Heil, D.D., Percy George Cross, D.D.

THE WONDERFUL BOOK!



WHEN the devout soul broods in meditation and prayer over the blessed Word of God, forgetful of all the clamor and confusion of the world, shut in with Jesus in the secret place, O how rich and deep and wonderful that Word appears! How real the things unseen and eternal! How enrapturingly beautiful and transforming the vision of God!

Waiting with open, expectant, responsive heart in this audience chamber of the Most High, what upliftings of the depressed soul to heights of far-off, beautiful vision! What holy interviews in the sweet silence in the holiest of all! What privileged intrusions into the reserved places within the veil! Then what delightful walks of fellowship beside still waters, in fragrant fields and leafy groves of the Word, coming at unexpected turns face to face with the Fairest One, hearing His voice telling us some of the reserved "many things" He has yet to say unto us!

O Lord, "How sweet are Thy words unto my taste! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth!

"More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the dropping of honeycombs."—
H. B. Hartzler, D.D.

FRANK J. BOYER. PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price \$2.00 the Year Canada \$2.25, Foreign \$2.35 Single Copy 20 Cents

Entered as Second-class matter, at the Post Office, Reading, Pa., under act of March 3, 1897.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

CONTENTS—JULY, 1924

EDITORIAL

An Unsatisfactory Solution— <i>D. S. Kennedy, D.D.</i>	345
The Hall of the Age Man— <i>L. S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	346
Music in the Church— <i>William H. Bates, D.D.</i>	348
The Fundamentals— <i>David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.</i>	349
Tired	352
The Fundamentalists and Romanism— <i>D. S. Kennedy, D.D.</i>	353
Characteristics of the Destructive Rationalists— <i>D. S. Kennedy, D.D.</i>	354
What a State Governor Thinks	355
Business— <i>David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.</i>	355
Notes and Comments	356

THE ARENA

The Bible the Foundation of the American Republic— <i>Wilbur M. Smith, D.D.</i>	362
Cogitations of a Foggy— <i>W. MacNicholl, D.D.</i>	371
The World— <i>William H. Bates, D.D.</i>	377
Similitudes of the Christ, Joseph and Jesus— <i>Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D.</i>	378
A Balanced Ration— <i>Lawrence Keister, D.D.</i>	380
Wisdom and Wit from Spurgeon	381

THE SANCTUARY

The Disciple Whom Jesus Loved— <i>William H. Bates, D.D.</i>	382
The Crowns of Scripture	386

THE PRAYER MEETING SERVICE— <i>A. William Lewis, D.D.</i>	387
---	-----

LIBRARY TABLE— <i>Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	389
--	-----

Important Instructions: All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

Change in Address—It is very important that Old as well as New address be given. Always allow at least 10 days to make a change.

Expiration and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a renewal. We receipt new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration, therefore, by authority of the U. S. Postoffice Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are expected to notify us to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

FRANK J. BOYER, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Volume 30

JULY, 1924

No. 7

EDITORIAL

An Unsatisfactory Solution



HERE are a good many well-meaning persons in the religious world today who, disturbed by the diversity of intellectual constructions placed on the facts that lie at the basis of the Christian religion, have persuaded themselves that they have solved the problem for all practical purposes, by emphasizing the distinction between fact and theory. They tell us that the essence of Christianity lies in its facts rather than its theories, and that if we hold fast to the facts, we can sit lightly to the theories. No doubt a certain interest attaches to the theories, to the intellectual constructions that men have placed on the facts, but this interest is a secondary one to such a degree that men who differ widely in the realm of theory may be essentially one in their religious experience.

It is impossible, however, to distinguish as sharply between fact and theory as these would have us believe. The distinction is valid within limits, but it always remains merely a relative distinction, a distinction of emphasis, not of essence. And that because, on the one hand, there is no known fact of which we do not have some theory, and on the other hand, there is no theory of any value which does not construe some fact. Whatever plausibility attaches to the distinction is derived from its application to events of a purely physical nature, as when we are told that it is fire that burns us and not our theory of heat, or that it is the food we eat that nourishes us, and not any theory we hold concerning the manner it does this. It is, of course, true that fire burns and food nourishes the intelligent and the unintelligent alike. When, however, we have in mind facts that appeal to the intelligence, to the emotions, to the conscience, the distinction loses all plausibility; for such facts have significance for us and influence our lives only as they are understood.

To other than those facts that act in a

purely physical way, the words of the late James Denny are applicable: "A fact of which there is absolutely no theory is a fact which stands out of relation to everything in the universe, a fact which has no connection with any part of our experience: it is a blank unintelligibility, a rock in the sky, a mere irrelevance in the mind of man. There is no such thing conceivable as a fact of which there is no theory, or even a fact of which we have no theory; such a thing could not enter our world at all; if there were such a thing, it would have no interest for us and no effect upon us whatever. An absolutely unintelligible fact, to an intelligent being, is exactly equivalent to zero." It is only necessary to add that the facts of Christianity are facts that appeal to the intelligence, to the emotions, to the conscience; and hence that they do not and cannot act upon and influence us apart from our understanding of them. No doubt we may be genuine Christians, while having a very imperfect understanding of these facts; but some understanding of them we must have if they are to have any conscious significance for us whatever.

It is highly significant, moreover, that this distinction finds no support in the New Testament. When we turn its pages, we have our attention directed not only to the facts that lie at the bases of the Christian religion, but to an interpretation of these facts. We discover, moreover, that the writers of these pages no more find the essence of Christianity in the facts that lie at its basis than in the interpretation they place on those facts. The facts are indeed essential. Apart from them, there would be no such thing as Christianity. And yet, unless we place the same interpretation on these facts as do the writers of the New Testament, they will not yield us Christianity. Deny the reality of these facts, and Christianity at once dissolves into myths and legends. Admit the reality of the facts, but give them

no interpretation, and they will not yield us Christianity. Admit the reality of these facts, but give them an interpretation other than that of the writers of the New Testament, and they will yield us something other than Christianity. It is only when we both accept these facts as facts and place upon them the same interpretation that the New Testament does that they yield us Christianity. It is these facts interpreted in a particular way that gives us Christianity. We lose the thing we call Christianity as truly, therefore, when we reject the interpretation as when we reject the facts. The significance of the New Testament is not rightly grasped until we realize that it contains not only a record of certain facts, but an authoritative interpretation of those facts.

This distinction, perhaps, is most frequently employed in connection with the fact of Christ's death. How often we are told that the fact of Christ's death is of supreme importance, but the theory that explains that fact is of no importance! Here, as little as elsewhere, does the distinction find support in the New Testament. Paul's own religious experience is a striking case in point. It was not the mere fact that Christ died that made him a Christian. He was aware of the fact in

his pre-Christian days; but in those days he placed an interpretation on the fact that did not make him a Christian—an interpretation that made him strongly anti-Christian. It was not until he not only realized the falsity of that interpretation, but was led to put a quite different interpretation on this fact, that he became a Christian. Paul, therefore, was writing out of his own experience—when he wrote, "The love of Christ constraineth me because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died," *i.e.*, the death of Christ had significance for him and his fellow-Christians only because they placed a certain intellectual construction upon it.

This alleged antithesis between the facts and theories of Christianity we believe, therefore, to be a wholly false one. Christianity consists neither in its theories as distinguished from its facts nor in its facts as distinguished from its theories. It consists in both. Its theories are but the interpretation of its facts; and it is its facts that give content to its theories. The theories without the facts would be empty; the facts without the theories or interpretations would be blank and dumb and unmeaning.—D. S. K.

"The Hall of the Age Man"



IT can truly be said that Dr. John Roach Straton has the courage of his convictions. He marches right into the citadel of the enemy. Recently he visited the American Museum of Natural History, of which Prof. H. F. Osborn is the head. In these columns descriptions of the Hall of Man in that institution have already been given. It needs only to be said here that the fossil remains of animals and men are so arranged and manipulated as to make visitors believe that man came up from the slime through mollusks, worms, reptiles and beasts. In spite of the fact that the fossils, on Prof. Osborn's own confession, are very meager, evolution is exhibited as if it were a proven fact, and there is no hint in the whole museum that man might have had a different origin and history. These data were brought to light in a most vivid way in a sermon by Dr. Straton, which was quite fully reported in the New York papers, copies of which were sent to us.

Prior to his sermon, Dr. Straton wrote a

letter to Dr. Osborn informing him of his purpose to criticise the managers of the Museum for their one-sided display. This was open and frank. In his letter Dr. Straton made the following suggestion. Let the reader himself judge whether it was not fair and honest:

"I think it beyond controversy that fair play and just treatment to the religious community requires that you put into the 'Hall of the Age Man' something to set forth the fact that there is another view of the origin of the world and of man than that set forth in the evolutionary hypothesis, and as the Bible view of the universe and of man is the one upon which the civilized world has run down to modern times, I think it is entirely logical and proper that such an exhibit should be founded as I suggest upon the Bible. I shall await with great interest your reply to this humble but sincere suggestion, and if I can be of any service whatsoever in connection with these matters, I assure you it will give me a genuine and abiding pleasure. All

good wishes for you personally and for the museum."

To this letter Dr. Osborn replied somewhat curtly. He sent Dr. Straton autograph copies of three of his books for the minister's careful perusal. He said that he "was brought up in a religious atmosphere by a wonderful Christian mother, who taught me, above all things, to tell the truth." Then he added, in the well-known *ex cathedra* style of the evolutionist: "The truth is that the ascent of man is and always will be a long struggle between his higher spiritual and moral nature and his purely physical nature. It is of the utmost importance that this truth should be taught by the church."

Of course, here is simply the categorical assertion that evolution is "the truth." But Dr. Osborn ought to know that that is simply begging the question. Whether evolution is "the truth" or not is the very issue in debate. Dr. Osborn may say that he has proved evolution in his books. But we have read his books, or at least most of them, and find them not only unconvincing, but full of the logical fallacies known as *non-sequiturs*, begging the question, over-broad generalization and arguing in a circle. To prove what we have said, we simply ask the question, Are the few bones, which Dr. Osborn himself admits to be very meager, a sufficient basis for dogmatically teaching a theory as if it were scientifically established? Again, can the theory be said to be "proved," when not a single clear case of spontaneous generation or transmutation of species has ever been brought forward?

In his sermon Dr. Straton pointed out many objections to evolution, which the lay mind can weigh judicially and which the scientific mind ought to be able to weigh, and which prove one thing clearly and convincingly, namely, that evolution is still very much in the hypothetical stage. In this case he rightly insists that the exhibit in the Hall of Man, intended for the instruction of the general public, is entirely one-sided. Both sides should be presented. There are millions of people who by their taxes have helped to erect the buildings of the Museum, even if they do not furnish the money for the exhibits, and who believe that the Bible gives the true account of the origin of man. They have their rights, which should be respected. Besides, the public in general is invited to visit the Museum. School children by the hundreds are conducted through the buildings and shown the exhibits. Many of them are brought up in Christian homes, and are

taught to accept the Bible throughout as the Word of God. They have their rights. No public museum, located on ground furnished by the public, has a right to undermine the faith of millions of its tax-paying citizens. It is fair play—yes, American fair play—that both sides of the story of man should be given, so that the people and their children may judge for themselves which is the more likely to be true. Evolutionists are unfair and un-American if they refuse to place in the museum such an exhibit as Dr. Straton proposes, showing the Biblical account of man's origin.

Now how does Dr. Osborn come back at Dr. Straton? We quote from his precise language as given by a New York paper: "The American Museum of Natural History can take care of itself. I do not think that Dr. Straton's charges of 'treason against God' and 'libel on the human race' are worthy of any further statement. I would like to make it plain that no one at the museum—myself least of all—is in any way perturbed or irritated by the preacher's activities. It is certainly not the intention of the museum to enter into any controversy with Dr. Straton on the issues he raises."

There speaks the American pope! Either that, or the spoiled and sulking child! It is hard to tell which. We venture the opinion—and the more we think of it, the more we are convinced—that Dr. Osborn knows he cannot answer Dr. Straton's arguments against evolution, and therefore he simply holds up his head in smug assurance, and pretends that he is not perturbed. In the name of reason, why should not a man, taught by his Christian mother "above all things to tell the truth," want the public to have the whole subject thoroughly canvassed, so that the truth may have free course? The trouble with the evolutionists—and we say it with sorrow, not with anger—is that they are too papistic. It is not the truth they want so much as they want their own way. If they deny Dr. Straton's reasonable request, they display their narrowness and prejudice by that very denial.—L. S. K.

* * *

Take every experience of life, take every joy of life: a man either becomes the slave of joy and prosperity, being made self-conceited by it, or he becomes the master of his prosperity and joy, compelling it to render richness to his character, to mellow his whole life into a fuller and deeper relationship to God.—*Phillips Brooks.*

Music in the Church



It is fortunate that the important functioning of music in the Church has so much to serve and promote it,—never so much as now.

Edmund S. Lorenz, of the Lorenz Publishing Co. of Dayton, Ohio, was a clergyman, and became a college president. An unfortunate—perhaps it was fortunate!—health breakdown compelled a lament like Job's, "My purposes are broken off" (xvii, 11). At length recovering sufficiently to undertake work, what should be the new line of service? He was divinely led, we believe, to choose music, for which he was so well adapted by capability, taste, and culture. He founded *The Choir Leader*, a musical monthly, and afterwards was added *The Choir Herald*. The letter-press of these journals is the same, but the music is different, both furnishing a new anthem for each Sunday of the year. The music of the first is from difficult to medium, the second from medium to easy. Later came *The Volunteer Choir*, the music easier still, and there was added also *Der Kirchenchor*. Thus music is purveyed for choirs of all grades. The output of these journals for the last December number was, after thirty years of enterprise, 100,000 copies. The catalogs of the House show that the design is to meet the demands of the whole scope of church music, both vocal and instrumental.

In 1909 Mr. Lorenz published a 425-page book, "Practical Church Music: A Discussion of Purposes, Methods, and Plans." We read it over and over again. The judgment we pronounced then was that it contained more good, sound, musical common sense to the square inch than any other book we ever saw. The author captured us completely, and ever since, reading his admirable editorials in *Leader* and *Herald*, we have been more and more his willing and loyal captive, as this writing may evidence!

Now has just come off the press (Revell Company, \$3.50) another book, "Church Music: What A Minister Should Know About It," for which, after reading every word of it, and some of it repeatedly, we have only words of unqualified commendation and praise.

It is said that there are two things that a pastor of a church should never have anything to do with: the finances of his church, and his choir. The writer has always let the finances severely alone, except the benefi-

cences: the Lord's causes as represented by the Boards of the church have uniformly received assiduous attention. As to the choir, that is another matter. From early boyhood, before voice changed, on through the years as singer, choir leader, organist, and then pastor, we have been linked up with this department of the Lord's host,—the War Department as some one wittily and somewhat wickedly, but with something of justification, denominates it. Yet we never had a "choir row." Besides, we have been assistant compiler of a hymn-book of 1500 hymns and its musical editor, fitting 275 tunes to its hymns of 75 different meters. Do pardon this personal reference, for it is made only to intimate that the writer's training and experience may possibly entitle what he says on this subject to an added increment of consideration and weight.

We have in this second book the added fourteen years of Mr. Lorenz' growth, experience, training, maturing wisdom, clarified and crystalized. The fine spirit and purpose pervading it breathe in these two sentences which we quote: "From the supreme height of spiritual efficiency in soul winning and soul building alone can the servant of God secure the complete panorama of the subject, including the lesser peaks to which allusion has been made" (p. 22). "In his study of church music the minister must recognize that while fitness, dignity, intellect, culture, shall all have their modifying influence, the determining consideration in our whole investigation and study shall be moral and spiritual results" (p. 23).

There is, first, an understanding Foreword by that adept in church music, Rev. Dr. Cleland B. McAfee, professor of systematic theology in the McCormick theological seminary, followed by the author's illuminating Preface. The Introduction, in three chapters, presents the Ideas underlying the discussion of church music, Why a minister should study music, and What a minister should know about music.

Part I, in three chapters expounds "The Philosophy of Musical Sounds." Part II is on "The Psychology of Music." This, in six chapters, goes over ground in a surprisingly lucid way that we venture to say is to nine-tenths of ministers, a *terra incognita*, and that every one ought thoroughly to understand. As we read Chapter XI, on "Church Music As Applied Art," we said:

"This one chapter is worth the price of the book." Part III, of 207 pages, has sixteen chapters on "The History of Church Music," beginning with the origin of music, tracing it through pre-Christian times, Egyptian, Assyrian, Hebrew, Greek; then we have the story told of early Christian music; music under papal auspices, medieval music, music of the Reformation, the developments in England, Scotland, America, bringing the whole subject clearly down to date. Any one, minister or otherwise, who conducts song services, cannot afford to be without the information which these chapters give. We had gone over much of this ground and had produced a brochure that we thought was rather worth

while, but when we came to read this History, there was more than a suggestion that our place was in a back seat,—way back. Part IV, of four chapters, is on "The Pipe Organ," the information in which any church or society contemplating getting such an instrument cannot afford to do without.

Each chapter has at the beginning "suggestions" for teaching its contents, and at the chapter's end a list of "review questions," in which the college president, the expert teacher, the practiced pedagogue, is revealed in all his glory. We understand that already there are theological seminaries introducing it into their curriculum as a text book. But it tells what *every* minister should know.—*W. H. B.*

The Fundamentals



None of the darkest hours of David's life, when his faith was fluttering like a bird beset by a storm of arrows, he lifted his eyes to the immovable hills with this appeal, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

Well, *what can they do?*

If there ever was a time for asking that question it is now; and our Lord himself answers it in the Parable of the Two Houses (Matthew 7: 24-27).

It is the fashion of late to speak of Christians who stand for their faith as "Fundamentalists." Thanks to unbelievers for the word! Fundamentalists? So be it! Believers are not building castles in the air. They dream dreams and see visions, like Jacob at Bethel, but the ladder on which their dreams and visions ascend to heaven rests on an impregnable rock. The trees that grow upon that rock may bend to every wind that blows; but the foundations endure though the earth be removed and the mountains be cast into the midst of the sea.

The fundamentals of Christian faith are not many, but they are fundamental; so much so that if they be removed the whole superstructure is as rickety and ramshackle as an outhouse floating in a freshet. We say, "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity." So far, so good; but the essentials come first, else our boasted liberty and charity are empty words.

What then does Paul mean by saying, "*Leaving the principles* of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection?" Read on, my friend; "not laying again the founda-

tion of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God." (Heb. 6:1.) In other words, the principles of the Gospel once accepted are thenceforth to be "left" as facts permanently settled; to be left not as a wayward boy leaves his father's house but as a house in process of erection leaves the foundations set for it.

Here is the secret of progress in character and usefulness. The Christian is "dynamic" only because his foundations are "static." His character rises like a growing superstructure on fundamentals that cannot be moved. If a mathematician were to insist on going back continually to prove the axioms he would never so much as cross the *pons asinorum*. Some things must be regarded as settled "once for all."

What are these fundamentals? They are briefly comprehended in two. But, before going any farther, let it be observed that a man may be religious without being a Christian. The distinction is clear: religion is believing in God, while Christianity is believing in God as revealed in the person of his only-begotten and well-beloved Son.

It is simply grotesque for one to call himself a Christian while rejecting the unequivocal and persistent claims of Jesus not only of equality but of identity with God; as for example where he said to Philip, "Have I been so long time with you and yet hast thou not known me? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, 'Show us the Father?' Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" The only way of honestly meeting this and similar claims is either by assuming that Jesus was

beside himself or by standing squarely with Caiaphas in saying, "He hath spoken blasphemy and is guilty of death." There is in logic and common honesty no middle ground. He was an imposter or he was what he claimed to be.

No end of futile efforts have been made to build some sort of church on Jesus as a mere man. Unitarianism, under that name or any other, has always been as dead as a still-born child. This is because the average man is addicted to common sense, "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation;—the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies and the waters shall overflow the hiding-place." (Isaiah 28: 16, 17.)

The answer to Peter's good confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," was this: "Upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. 16: 18.) No less positive and unmistakable are Paul's words to the church members of Corinth, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 3: 11-15.)

The reason why our Lord said to his disciples, "Ye believe in God, believe also in me" (John 14: 1), was because there is no approach to the Father except through him. No amount of sophistry can explain away his words, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me." (John 14: 6.) In other words, Christianity is simply a personal relation of the believer with Christ; so that he can say, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." (2 Tim. 1: 12.)

But observe how much is involved in such an acceptance of Christ.

First, his supernatural birth. This is the Alpha of our Christian faith. Let that be accepted and the whole alphabet follows, as a matter of course. Deny it and, like a planet that leaves its orbit, there is no telling where unbelief will carry you. The virgin birth is the seal of the Father's approval affixed to the claims of Jesus as his only begotten Son. Why should it be thought unreasonable that God should beget a Son? For no conceivable reason except that it involves a miracle, as it is written, "Great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in flesh; the angels desire to look into it!" If we begin by denying the

possibility of miracles we might as well decide at once that there is nothing worth while in Christianity, for Christ himself is the greatest miracle of all.

Second, his supernatural life. The life that began with a miracle was crowded full of miracles. Was it not prophesied, "His name shall be called Wonderful?"

His Character was wonderful: so absolutely unique as to be miraculous from beginning to end. Was there ever another who could say, "Who layeth anything to my charge?" He was confessedly the only man who ever justified such a claim in this sinful world of ours.

His Words were wonderful. In the preaching of his brief ministry he touched upon every problem in the vast realm of doctrine and ethics, and offered solutions which are approved not only by hundreds of millions of Christians but by the thoughtful people of the world today. It was not his friends but an armed guard of his enemies who, on hearing him, said, "Never man spake like this man!"

His Works were wonderful. His whole biography is summed up in the brief monograph, "He went about doing good." He was the good physician: "Where'er he went affliction fled and sickness raised her drooping head." And every one of his healings was miraculous. The people of his time never thought of comprehending or explaining them, much less of explaining them away: they simply said, "We never saw it on this fashion," or "We have seen strange things today!"

Third, his supernatural Death. He came into the world to die, because sin involves death, as it is written in the law, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." He took our place before the offended law, "bearing our sins in his own body on the tree": as again it is written, "He that knew no sin was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Did ever another die that way? We, each for himself alone, must pass through the little wicket-gate: whereas "he tasted death for every man." The only one for whom he did not die was himself. It was the thought of this singular self-abnegation that moved the infidel Rousseau to write, "Others have died philosophically but this Jesus of Nazareth died like a God!"

Fourth, his supernatural Resurrection. The word is from *resurgere*, "to rise again." It means nothing unless it means that the same

body that went into the grave came out of it. This was a miracle, of course; and any attempt to explain it away can be prompted only by an aversion to everything beyond the purview of the physical senses. The Saviour's triumph over death is the divine seal on his whole redemptive work; as it is written, "If Christ be not risen your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins!" (Read 1 Cor. 15: 14-19.)

Fifth, his supernatural Ascension. It is spoken of as "supernatural" because it was superior to all known natural laws. At the close of his last sermon to his disciples he arose out of their midst, with hands uplifted in benediction, and as they gazed upward in silent wonder the heavens opened to receive him. "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, that the King of Glory may enter in!"

Sixth, his supernatural Reign. He sits upon a throne high and lifted up while angels and archangels veil their faces before him. Not only so: he rules in the affairs of nations and the children of men. "The dead hand of Jesus," of which Napoleon spoke, has a more commanding influence in current events than all the living hands of all the earthly kings and potentates. In vain have undevout historians like Hume and Gibbon sought to explain away this "power of the Nazarene."

But the miracle of all miracles,—running through all prophecy and overtopping all the hopes of all believers from the beginning until now—is yet to come:

Seventh, his supernatural reappearing to assume the government of this world. When? I wish I knew; but "the times and the seasons are with God." Only this is certain: in the fulness of time he that shall come will come and will make no tarrying, "Amen; even so come, Lord Jesus!"

Not these seven supernatural facts are all involved—vitality and inseparably involved—in the acceptance of Christ on his own recognition as the coequal Son of God.

But how are we to know that they are true? Certainly not because you or I or anybody else says so. Your "inner consciousness" is nothing to me. The fact that hundreds of millions of Christians believe that way is no more convincing than the fact that hundreds of millions of Buddhists believe another way. Here is the question: is there any satisfactory *authority* anywhere for the stupendous claims of our Christian faith? *Not unless the Bible is the trustworthy Word of God.*

The written Word stands voucher for the

incarnate Word; thus furnishing a complete revelation of God.

"Do you mean" some one asks, "that Christ and the Bible stand or fall together?" Not at all: there is no question of falling. They *stand* together!

One who has really made the acquaintance of Jesus can scarcely think of him otherwise than as he stood at the beginning of his ministry, in the synagogue at Nazareth, *with the Book in his hand.* He loved that Book, knew it by heart, preached it, practiced it, commended it to his disciples, specifically approved the very portions of it which are most frequently called in question, *and never uttered one word or syllable to indicate that he did not believe it from beginning to end.* This being so, it is humbly submitted that the Book which was good enough for him ought to be good enough for those who profess to follow him.

But the point of supreme importance just here is that he based the ultimate authority for his Gospel on this Book. How otherwise are we to interpret his words, "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead?" If that means anything it means that our faith rests on the integrity of the Scriptures as the veritable Word of God.

But the question is, How are we to know that the Bible is the Word of God? Does the mere say-so of Jesus make it so? Certainly not for those who are not as yet convinced that he was what he claimed to be. But there is a sure way.

Open the Book. It is entitled to a square deal. The man who, being taken up in the lips of talkers, condemns the Bible without knowing what it contains is self-convicted, so far forth, as a dishonest man.

Then, *Read it.* And when a man begins to read he at once discovers that the Book sets up a stupendous claim for itself, to wit, that it was "Written by holy men as they were moved (literally, borne onward, like a ship before the wind) by the Spirit of God." Nor is this claimed for portions but for the whole of it; as it is written, "All Scripture is given by inspiration": the word being *theopnustia*, literally "breathed of God." If that claim is valid it behooves every right thinking man to know it.

Furthermore, *Search it.* So said Jesus; "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye (rightly) think ye have eternal life and these are they which testify of me." The word ren-

dered "search is *ereunate*, used of a hound on the scent. Shall we search it *critically*? Why, certainly. The Book shrinks from no ordeal by fire or fuming acid so long as there is an honest quest of truth. All that it asks of its critics is that they approach it with an open mind, free from prejudice and willing to be convinced. Is that too much?

And then what? *Abide by the outcome.*

If the Book vindicates its claim, then every supernatural fact of the Gospel rests on evidence *furnished by the authority of the living God*. Otherwise the truth-seeker is left to shift for himself like a shipwrecked mariner without chart or compass on an open sea.

"Do you mean," asks somebody, "that your religion is the religion of a Book? Certainly, why not? Precisely as our Republic rests upon a written Constitution. Its basic principles are there, writ so plain that the wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein. Pointed fingers are not arguments. If the Bible could have been laughed out of court the Lucians and Voltaires and Ingersolls would have disposed of it long ago; but, because it stands to reason that no thesis can hold its own without foundation in ultimate and infallible authority, the long-derided, unfairly-criticised, mutilated and maltreated Bible

stands as the best seller in the book markets of the world today.

"But if Christ was himself 'the fullness of the Godhead bodily' what need of any further revelation of the truths that center in God?" Let it be remembered that Christ lived in a remote corner of the world for a brief period of thirty years: yet he came avowedly to establish a religion for the whole world and all the centuries. In order that his teachings might be thus universalized and perpetuated is it not obvious that they must be recorded somewhere and somehow? And where better than in a Book "written by holy men as they were moved by the Spirit of God?"

In conclusion, let me invite you to join the Bereans; of whom it is written, "They were more honorable than the Thessalonians, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." But I forewarn you that in doing so you are morally certain to become a Fundamentalist before you are through with it. Which is only another way of saying that you will become a Christian; rich in everything that makes life worth living or heaven worth hoping for, rich in the hid treasures of Christ, rich forevermore toward God!"—D. J. B.

Tired



WE have received a letter from an elder in a prominent Presbyterian church in Washington, D. C., who is also a Sunday-school superintendent. He says, "I am strong for the fundamentals," but as to the present controversy that is waging he says, "I am very tired of it, and I get the same word from many of my friends in different parts of the country."

The good elder expresses our mind exactly. We are tired, very tired, of it. We wish it would stop. But what can those who are "strong for the fundamentals" do? Surrender? It is a case of life and death. If modernism wins—a religion that has only reformation, no regeneration, *i.e.* no Bible salvation, in it—then Christianity, except as a mere ethical or moral force is wiped off the map. That will never do. We cannot stand for that. We have too much at stake. We will strike "until the last armed foe expires" or until we expire.

Yet, after all, this controversy, as many

see it, is not without its compensations. The rector of St. Thomas's Episcopal Church in New York City is reported as saying in a sermon, "The controversy between conservatives and liberals in the Protestant Church is resulting in great good, because people are thoughtfully discussing religion as never before."

The Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, a pastor emeritus of the church in which Professor Fosdick preaches, says: "We are justified in believing that the present disturbed condition of doctrinal thought is a promising symptom of spiritual life, a necessary phase in the progress of church history. Such progress will not accrue from abbreviation of creed."

No question is ever settled until it is settled right. Those who have intellectual vision to see clearly and intellectual penetration to see through, see that the issue between Christianity's supernaturalism and modernism's naturalism—mutually oppugnant and destructive

as they necessarily are—unmistakably is *Christianity or no Christianity*. Those whose minds are obfuscated with fuzzywuzzy thinking, do not see that this is the issue, and they tire of the turmoil and cry for peace, peace, when there is not and cannot be peace. They cry for tolerance when the real inwardness of their cry is nothing more nor less than indifference. Depend upon it, only the *right*

settlement of any question can bring rest in regard to it.

Gideon and his three hundred, notwithstanding they had "the sword of the Lord," were tired, very tired, but it is said of them, "faint, yet pursuing."

The elder also says, "I am afraid the next General Assembly is heading us onto the rocks." We hope not.

The Fundamentalists and Romanism



F we are to believe what a good many Liberals are telling us, the Fundamentalist movement in the churches is a movement toward Rome. It is somewhat difficult to take such a representation seriously, but at any rate it is one that we meet more and more frequently in current liberal literature. For instance, Dr. Frederick Lynch, in a recent issue of *The Christian Work*, warns against the "dangerous Romanizing of the church by the Fundamentalists." He even tells us that "the Fundamentalists are much nearer Romanism than Dr. Orchard and the High Anglicans, with their altars, their masses, and their incense."

When we inquire as to the grounds on which this charge rests, we are told that the Fundamentalists, like the Romanists, recognize an external authority in religion. Now, if the recognition of an external authority in religion is that which distinguishes Romanism from Protestantism, it may be freely conceded that the Fundamentalists are much nearer Rome than they suspect. For, unquestionably, the Fundamentalists do believe in an external authority in religion. Much as they differ among themselves, they are all agreed that the Bible is the Word of God, and as such an infallible rule of faith and practice. In that case, however, it must be as freely admitted that there is only a superficial difference between Romanism and Protestantism in general, seeing that Protestantism as truly as Romanism has always recognized an external authority in religion. Dr. Lynch's representation, therefore, proves too much. It carries with it the notion that Protestantism as a whole represents a "dangerous Romanizing of the church." Nothing could be more absurd.

The recognition of an external authority in fact not merely a mark of Romanism. It is equally a mark of Christi-

anity itself, so that it is impossible for the consistent thinker to reject external authority and be a Christian at all. "There is nothing more important in the age in which we live," wrote Dr. Warfield, "than to bear constantly in mind that all the Christianity of Christianity rests precisely on 'external authority.' Religion, of course, we can have without 'external authority,' for man is a religious animal, and will function religiously always and everywhere. But Christianity, no. Christianity rests on 'external authority,' and that for the very good reason that it is not a product of man's religious sentiment, but is a gift from God. To ask us to set aside 'external authority' and throw ourselves back on what we find within us alone—call it by whatever name you choose, 'religious experience,' 'the Christian consciousness,' 'the inner light,' 'the immanent divine,—is to ask us to discard Christianity and revert to natural religion." When, therefore, Liberals affirm that Fundamentalists are "Romanizing" the church because of their recognition of an external authority in religion, what these Liberals are really doing is to advertise the extent of their departure from all that can be honestly and intelligently called Christianity.

It is no doubt true that Fundamentalists, that Conservatives in general, have more in common with Roman Catholics than they have with Liberals, so-called. But this finds its explanation in the fact that Roman Catholicism is merely a perversion of the Christianity of Christ and his apostles, while Liberalism is a falsification of it. The Fundamentalists are as much opposed to Rome as were their fathers, but they are even more opposed to that Liberalism that is apparently dominant in many sections of the church to-day. For while Rome recognizes and defends Theism, the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the Cross, as an atoning sacrifice, the Scriptures as the Word of God, Liberalism

retains nothing distinctive of Christianity but the name. Fortunately, we do not have to choose between Roman Catholicism and Liberalism *i. e.*, between a perversion and a falsification of Christianity. In evangelicalism we have what at least approximates to pure Christianity.

The distinguishing distinction between Romanism and Protestantism is not to be found, as Dr. Lynch and others would have us believe, in their respective attitudes toward *authority*. Much as they have always differed as to the seat of authority, they have always occupied common ground in recognizing and maintaining the existence of an external authority in religion. The distinguishing dis-

inction between Romanism and Protestantism is to be found rather in their respective attitudes toward *sacerdotalism*. Their deepest difference concerns God's method in saving men—Does God save men by acting immediately on their souls, or does he save them through the medium of the church and its ordinances established by him for that purpose? The answer of all the Fundamentalists of which we have any knowledge is the answer of the Evangelical, and not the answer of the Sacerdotalist. It would be difficult, in fact, to discover a body of Christians who would be less at home among Roman Catholics than the Fundamentalists.—D. S. K.

Characteristics of the Destructive Rationalist



IN the present wave of destructive rationalism, it is well to note with some care the characteristics of its order of procedure, as compared with that of evangelicism.

1. It discards authority in all matters of religion, and that later leads to the rejection of authority in civil government. The evangelical puts high value on the reason as a receptive power, when supernatural truth is brought within its reach by revelation. The rationalist exalts the reason to the power of reaching up into the supernatural, and therefore needing no revelation. As the light of the sun comes down to the eye and the eye is able to receive the impression and evidence of the sun, so the supernatural truth of God comes down from God and the reason is able to receive it. The sun is its own evidence. So also is the Revelation of God. There is certain accessory and corroborative evidence of the sun, but it is not dependent on it. So the Revelation bears its own evidence to the reason that it is from God. The light of the sun is the guide in the physical life. So the Bible is the authority for faith and practice, and its teachings are final and full. The rationalist's treatment is like a man who would bandage his eyes and then grope his way through the world, independent of the sun. To the evangelical, the Bible is full and final authority in faith and practice. To the rationalist, there is no authority, and he gropes his way.

2. The rationalist assumes and asserts. The evangelical presents evidence. The rationalist takes things as he sees them. The evan-

gelical takes what God says. The rationalist is always building up and tearing down, and this he calls progress; but he is saying and doing the same thing which his predecessors were doing ten centuries ago. The evangelical builds on God's unchanging foundations, and he is rising and progressing into the perfect day.

3. The rationalist loves centralization of power. The evangelical calls no man lord, nor master, nor father, nor teacher. He believes all men are free and equal by creation and all Christians are brethren. The rationalist of today magnifies the superman. He wants the masterly hand to manipulate and master minds to dictate. The evangelical is democratic. The rationalist of today is desiring and aiming to get control of the funds of the church through over-centralized machinery. The evangelical is determined to keep the power in the hands of the people.

4. The rationalist is big on strategy. He does not believe in discussion, and he works the gag law. The evangelical believes in a full and free discussion until the matter is fairly presented, and then to have a free vote, submitting to the majority in matters of policy and to God's Word alone in matters of principle.

It is evident, therefore, that rationalism and evangelicism are antagonists and can never be reconciled. It is vain to attempt to plaster up a union between them.—D. S. K.

* * *

The preacher with a warm heart will not long have a cold church.—*Ram's Horn Brown.*

What a State Governor Thinks



HE editor of *The Evening World*, New York, some time ago ran a symposium on the subject, "My Idea of God." One of the contributors was Governor Charles A. Templeton, of Connecticut, whose statements are worth reproducing here:

"An Infinite Being, all good and everywhere present, who works through us human beings as He finds us for the ultimate good of our race and races to come, not this year or next, but looking far forward into the future—here is a very brief and imperfect summary of my ideas.

"I am not a theologian, and I am not a philosopher. I am a simple citizen, an everyday man who is interested neither in abstruse discussions nor in unedifying questions of dogma. If I may be permitted to say so, I think that the simple faith of our fathers is much nearer right than some of the present-day strainings after truth. The faith, the belief, the hope of the simple-hearted man and woman who occupies the rear pew, comes closer to the truth than that of some of our modern-day clergy and the pseudo-philosopher type, who seem to think that there can be no

truth in simplicity, nothing worth having outside the spectacular. Truth and right are often found in the humble walks of life. Simplicity is nature's first law. It is the essence of Christianity. And I am a Christian.

"Personally, I am well satisfied with the Bible. Or, to summarize my articles of faith in briefer form, I find my conception of religion and of God contained in the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, the Apostle's Creed and the Lord's Prayer."

That sounds orthodox—that is, Biblically Christian. Of course, it is concise, and many people may think it inadequate; but, when you come to analyze it, one who believes that much would logically follow by believing in the simple gospel in all its fullness. Very different is the reply of May Irwin, the actress, who says:

"My conception of the Life Principle is strict adherence to the Golden Rule—the only religion I have ever tried to live."

We wonder whether May Irwin has ever really practiced even that part of the Christian religion without the help of divine grace. If so, there must be one actress in the world who was born an angel.

Business



HE right-living man is a busy man. Business is busy-ness. But business is of two kinds:

There is a transient sort of business, which has to do exclusively with the here and now. It puts the emphasis on the acquisition of wealth, or on pleasure or on the emoluments of this world. Is this sort of business worth while? Crowns are mere baubles, as we have discovered in these last days; the bloom of pleasure soon wears off; and as for wealth;

"If thou art rich, thou art poor;
Thou bearest thy heavy burden but a season
For, like an ass whose back with ingots bows,
And death unloads thee."

But there is another sort of business which takes into consideration the endless vistas of the future and its results are forever and ever. Our Lord had this in mind when he said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" And later he had this in mind when he said to his disciples "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness

and all these things shall be added unto you." He did not belittle the importance of earning a livelihood or of gaining a competence or of acquiring legitimate honors; but these were incidental. Alas, that men should so often, by over-estimating them, be side-tracked on the highway of life!

There is nothing more lamentable than for one to spend his life in pleasure or in the getting of a million only to die with nothing to show for it. But the business of the kingdom—ah, that is worth a man's while! To be a laborer together with God in the business of making this world a better place to live in and pointing souls to a better world further on; to follow in the footsteps of Christ, who "went about doing good" and to be employed continually in "doing good as we have opportunity unto all men," this is business worthy of immortal men. And when Jesus said "Seek ye first the kingdom" he meant precisely that we are to put the kingdom first, remanding all other things whatsoever to a subordinate place. His service, which is the

setting up of his kingdom in this world, is to be first, first, first! To put the emphasis anywhere else is to fall short of the larger possibilities of life.

In Boswell's life of Johnson he says that having asked the great man whether he had ever been inclined to turn aside from literary pursuits, he received this answer, "Yes; once I thought of learning to play the flageolet; but after taking a few lessons I found that it would interfere with my great work; because if I played the flageolet at all I must play it well. Therefore, I gave it up."

It behooves us thus to choose between the greater and the less. Love, duty, character,

usefulness must take precedence of crowns and fortunes. A man who had swung around the circle of life and found the proper place of emphasis was moved to say, "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord—that I may win him and be found in him—that I may know him and the power of his resurrection!"

Oh, splendid aspiration! Sublime ambition! To find the noblest and best, to so appraise truth and righteousness as to bring them into proper relations with all things else—this is to make life tell! This is to win the guerdon! This is to glorify God!—*D. J. B.*

Notes and Comments



WHAT is meant by the wrath of God? It is an expression found quite often in Holy Writ. It does not mean wrath in the sense of resentment or petty anger. It means "the recoil of the divine from sin." In other words, it is the reaction of God's righteousness against all forms of evil. A God whose nature did not thus recoil from and react against sin would be one whom ethical people could not respect. It is because of the righteous nature of God that He cannot forgive sin by mere fiat, and therefore requires that expiation be made. This expiation was most graciously and beneficently made by the eternal Son of God become incarnate in human nature. The atonement which Christ wrought was not a mechanical device, but a necessity in the very moral structure of the universe.

An added proof comes to hand at this writing of what has been said so often in this journal. Dr. Charles F. Potter, of liberalistic notoriety, gives this as the title of one of his addresses: "Evolution as the Fundamental Basis of Modernism." Yes, the two are vitally related. Without the theory of evolution there would be no basis and no occasion for the movement known as Modernism. Without evolution we can go back to the Biblical account of origins, and if we can accept that, we can accept *ex animo* all the rest of the Bible.

At this writing the papers are expatiating on the bronze statue made by Carl E. Akeley, representing a young man just emerging from the form of a gorilla. It was refused a place in the American Museum of Natural History,

New York, although Mr. Akeley is a member of the staff of that institution. So, Dr. Potter has taken it over, and has had it on exhibition in his church for the edification and spiritual uplift of his congregation. He thinks it so much more elevating than the Biblical view that man was created in the image of God and then fell into sin. For God to create man sinful and load him down with animalism from the start, that is so much more exhilarating—in some people's minds!

What reason did Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn give for refusing to admit Mr. Carl E. Akeley's gorilla-man statue to a place in the American Museum of Natural History? The *New York Times* gives the following quotation: "President Osborn is not willing to have Mr. Akeley's 'Chrysalis' connected with the name of the American Museum of Natural History, because the museum is a public and municipal institution of an educational character only, which neither by charter nor by municipal sanction has the authority to express opinions on works of art in any way connected with a matter in philosophical dispute." Why, that is the very reason why Dr. J. R. Straton objected to the exhibition in the Hall of the Age Man; in which case Dr. Osborn merely flouted at the idea. But we have noted for many years that you must not expect logical consistency in the thinking and conduct of the pundits of evolution.

Note another inconsistency in the above quotation from Dr. Osborn. He speaks of the said statue as dealing with "a matter in philosophical dispute." But all along Dr. Osborn has been proclaiming that evolution has

been *proved*. The Hall of the Age of Man in the museum is based on that very assumption. And now he says in another connection that it is a subject "in philosophical dispute." Is such talk a mark of logical coherence? If the evolutionists were better logicians—well, they would not be evolutionists. Most of all, if evolution is "a matter of philosophical dispute," what right has a public educational institution like the museum to set up for the public such an exhibition as the one given in the Hall of the Age of Man? Will not people think it over?

Again the editor of the New York *World* exposes his obtuseness, his lack of logical acumen and his want of information. He holds that the representations in the American Museum of Natural History are founded on "circumstantial proofs of the evolution of the race." We reply: If the proof is only "circumstantial," what right have the managers of the museum to use a public institution to exhibit the evolution theory as if it were proved, and then to call objectors unpleasant names? The said editor challenges the fundamentalists to send in their data against evolution to the museum. This very challenge proves that the said editor has not read the many books that have lately come from the press in opposition to evolution. He evidently has not seen Professor George McReady Price's great book, "The New Geology," in which proof, yes, empirical proof, is piled upon proof showing the evolution theory to have a very slender basis in the geological history of the world. The *World* editor also treats the Biblical account of the origins as if it were merely human "theory." This indicates again a lack of information regarding the scores and scores of great and scholarly works on the evidences of Christianity. Has he ever seen Ebrard's monumental work on "Christian Apologetics"? No, we venture to say he has never even heard of it.

Do the upholders of the Biblical doctrine of special creations ever read books on the other side? They certainly do, or they could not quote from them and try to show their unscientific and illogical methods. Just now we are reading with all diligence Prof. J. Arthur Thompson's latest book (1924), "What is Man?" The chief factors that impress us are the *aplomb* and the *non sequiturs* of the author. Just to show that we are not mistaken. Everywhere evolution is proclaimed as if it were settled beyond dispute. No dogmatist

in theology ever wrote with more assurance. Yet in many places in describing the process the author uses such words as "probably," "perhaps," "it may be," "we do not know." Note one concrete case. In beginning the discussion of the vital subject, "Factors in Man's Emergence," he says (p. 23): "We must begin with a confession of ignorance, for we do not know much about the factors of man's emergence." But, dear Professor Thompson, that is the very point on which we ought to have knowledge, and especially if the evolution theory is to be accepted outright by Christian people instead of the time-honored and Biblical doctrine of special creations. If "we do not know much about the factors in man's emergence" from an animal stock, then what good reason can be adduced for the Hall of Man in the American Museum of Natural History?

How was a backbone evolved? Marshall Dawson, in his recent book, "Nineteenth Century Evolution and After," tries to delineate the process as follows: Long, long ages ago certain spineless creatures of the rivers, instead of being contented to move about leisurely and easily in still water, as most of their companions did, decided that they would not succumb to their soft environment, and so remain jelly-fish forever, but would take their fate in their hands and would push up stream against the tide. This course required effort. In the course of ages the strenuous push and pull of these creatures developed a backbone. Thus vertebrate animals came into existence! Does any one seriously believe that backbones were evolved in that way? It seems that some people do. We would remind them that the salmons have been coming out of the deep sea every spring for ages and have breasted the strong current of the Columbia River, even making their way over the rocks and up the rapids, often lacerating their flesh; yet, so far as we know scientifically, they have never developed additional backbone, nor have they grown in size. So far as known, they are the same today that they were in the long ago. According to evolution, their heroic efforts should have made them as strong and big as whales by this time. Anyway, why did the whale, moving about in deep and quiet waters, grow to such enormous dimensions, while the salmon, which has put forth such strenuous efforts against strong currents, has grown to only a small size? Let evolutionists answer.

In spite of some things said in preceding paragraphs, we are going to indulge in a little speculation. We shall put our thoughts only in a tentative and suggestive way, not in the dogmatic style of the evolutionists. To our mind, it is doubtful whether the animal kingdom, as it is today, could survive through many millennia if it were not for man's presence on the earth. Man seems to preserve the balance in nature. He kills off the strong, dangerous and harmful carnivorous animals and birds, and thus gives the harmless and beneficial species a chance to thrive and multiply. It is probable (is it not?) that, if man did not do this, the carnivorous creatures would soon gain so much headway that other creatures would be gradually extirpated. The same fate would perhaps overtake the vegetable kingdom, because, without man's presence, the insects would become so numerous as to destroy it. What would follow? Even the carnivorous insects, birds and animals would perish by and by for lack of food. If our premise is correct, the conclusion would follow that there could not have been a long time when destructive creatures existed before the advent of man to preserve the balance in nature, for then the organic world would have committed suicide. It may be said that there are wilds in Africa and South America where nature does survive. But it must be remembered that even there savage people kill off the ferocious and blood-thirsty animals, so that they do not become too numerous. Besides, is it not true that in the darkest and most primitive wildernesses no really useful domestic animals and fowls can survive? The above suggestions are offered tentatively, and are, we believe, worthy of consideration.

Anent the subject just discussed, we would offer the further suggestion that, assuming the Biblical record of origins to be true, all creatures were originally created "good" and "very good" (Gen. 1: 10, 12; 18, 21, 25, 31). Thus there were no harmful creatures. They came only with the advent of sin (see Gen. 3: 14, 15, 17-19). Therefore the organic world could have existed in that condition for a long time, even forever if need be, without man to preserve nature's balance. After all, it seems that the Bible teaches the doctrine that tallies most closely with the data of nature as we know her today.

In a recent volume, "Back to Methuselah," Bernard Shaw uses all the resources of his invective against Darwinism. He attributes

to Neo-Darwinism the present appalling situation in Europe, and fears that even civilization may not survive the catastrophe. He speaks of the anti-moral and anti-religious influence of Darwinism. He uses this language in regard to Darwinism: "There is a hideous fatalism about it, a ghastly and damnable reduction of beauty and intelligence, of strength and purpose, of honor and aspiration." This certainly is a strong indictment. If an orthodox man were to use such rhetoric, he would be looked upon as almost a savage, ready to bring back the old days of fagots and *auto de fe's*. In his view of the logical outcome of Darwinism Mr. Shaw seems to be quite logical. However, when he adds that the hope of the world is not in Christianity, but in the "creative evolution" of Bergson, he seems to lose his sagacity, for evolution cannot create anything; it can only unfold what has been already brought into existence. How many people can understand Bergson? Not one in a hundred thousand. How many can understand Christianity? "The wayfaring men, though fools, need not error therein," so plain is the Christian way.

It is pathetic that so many intellectual men are so short-sighted in spiritual matters and even sometimes in ethical concerns. Dr. Charles W. Eliot, the well-known liberalist, believes that a "religious revival" will come if the churches will only throw their creeds into the discard and will get together in a "wide-open and all-comprehending church" that will tolerate all kinds of religious beliefs. But in this church the old forms and ceremonies of worship should be retained on account of their "sacred associations." To say nothing of theological and logical consistency, we would ask whether it would be honest to pretend to worship God according to forms that have been emptied of their real meaning. It is ever so; mere human reason, undirected by the Word and Spirit of God, always starts off on a tangent, and there is no telling how far it will finally depart from the principles of truth and righteousness. For our part, we will make no attempt to worship God, who sees the heart, with forms in which we do not heartily believe.

When Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away," what did He mean? He certainly meant that the present form of the universe shall pass away, if it shall not be totally destroyed, and give place to another and a bet-

ter cosmos. What else could His words have meant? Then what about the modernistic contention that there will be no visible coming of our Lord when these things shall take place? It is found to be contrary to the teaching of Christ. Then what kind of a Christ do the advocates of this cult proclaim? In one breath they bid their followers to follow Christ; in the next they deny the teaching of Christ. Was there ever a weaker and more illogical scheme than that of modernism?

But our Lord said, "My words shall not pass away." Has that prophecy been fulfilled? It has if we have the words of Christ truly and infallibly recorded in the New Testament. If they are not truly recorded there, then, after all, they have passed away, and some one is guilty of bearing false witness. You see how insecure the modernistic contention makes our religion by its denial of the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. On the other hand, it is easy to see the security of our holy faith if the Bible is entirely reliable.

What is it that gives us assurance that we have in the New Testament a fully inspired guide in matters of faith and practice? It is nothing less than Christ's own promise to His apostles: "But the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Was that promise ever fulfilled? If so, where? There is only one place—the New Testament, the writings of the apostles. If we do not find its fulfillment there, we do not find it anywhere. But if we do have it there, we have in the gospels a sure word, one on which we can fully rely; one on which we can trust our salvation for time and eternity. This is true because, since the Holy Spirit inerrantly brought back to the memory of the apostles whatever Christ taught, we may be sure that we have the very teaching of Christ. What a solid comfort and assurance that fact gives to our souls!

Many people seem to be confused as regards the claim today that Christian experience rather than the Bible is the norm of authority or the last court of appeal in religion. Let us try to clear up the matter. Christian experience does not determine the truth of the Holy Scriptures; it simply assures us of their truth. The Scriptures are true whether you and I believe them or not,

or whether we have experienced their truth or not. That is, they are objectively true. When you and I get an experience through the Holy Spirit, then we *know* that they are true. This principle might be illustrated. If you were blind, the sun would shine anyway; but you would not know it—at least, not by your own experience; but if you were cured of your blindness, so that you saw for yourself, then you would know that the sun is shining. This simile indicates the relation of the Word of God to true Christian experience.

"Forever, O Lord, thy Word is settled in heaven" (Ps. 199: 89). This is a wonderful statement. Has it a clear meaning? If so, what is it? It can simply mean this: that God from eternity determined to give to mankind a special revelation, and that special revelation is called His Word. But where do we find His Word? Only in the Bible. If the Bible is not God's Word, the saying of the Psalmist is an idle saying, and has no meaning at all. But what a solid satisfaction it is to the true believer in the Bible to know that it belongs to the eternal divine decree; that God from eternity meant to give to erring men this inerrant revelation! This fact places the eternal rock under the believer's feet.

It is cheering to reflect on another saying of the Psalmist: "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my pathway." First, it is "a lamp to our feet;" that is, it gives a light near at hand, so that we can see to take the next step. We never need to take a step in the dark. We may not always be able to see far around; but we do have enough light at all times to march along steadily and confidently. That is great satisfaction. Sometimes we must say, "One step enough for me;" but it is a great comfort that we can say so. The Word of God is also "a light to our pathway." This means that light is cast by the Bible on our entire journey from time to eternity. We need to have no doubt as to our origin, nor the purpose of our being, nor the destiny prepared for us as the children of God. What a "lamp"! What a "light"! Let us rejoice and be glad.

There are several kinds of polemicists. The true kind are those who engage in religious debate, not because they love it and would not prefer peace, but because they feel impelled by their consciences to refute errors and defend the truth. They do not haggle about small matters. The issues that are joined must be of enough importance to stir them

into the militant frame and into militant action. Another kind are those who engage in controversy merely from love of it; who are never at peace unless they are engaged in a quarrel. They glory in a word war and in an intellectual tilt. It affords them the only arena of conflict in which they care to enter. This is a wrong kind of polemics. There is still another, and possibly a worse, sort of polemicists. They are those who become controversial in condemning controversy. They sit somewhere out of danger—at least, they think they do—and throw stones and other missiles at those who are bravely contending for the faith. Sometimes—we could cite instances—they use more invectives against the fighters than the fighters themselves use. We believe only in the right kind of polemics, conducted in the right spirit and for causes that are worth contending for—yes, and even, if need be, dying for.

In line with the preceding paragraph, we wish to call attention to the fact that Christ and His apostles did not sit idly by and let things take their own course. They did not belong to the *laissez-faire* crowd, who contend that the truth will take of itself and needs no defence. Our Lord engaged in more than one controversy with His foes. When they accused Him of casting out devil by means of Beelzebub, He answered them most effectively, and showed the absurdity of their allegation. At one time he even told them to their faces, "Ye are of your father, the devil." More than once Paul held a polemic against the antinomians and the Judaizing teachers. At the last he was able to say, "I have fought a good fight." It would appear that Paul was wise enough to see that, while he was here on earth, he belonged to the church militant. He knew he had not yet gone to the church triumphant. Peter added that believers should be able to give a reason for their hope. Nor does Jude command the disciples of Christ to keep silent in the midst of error and assault, but distinctly bids them to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Of all men, we fear the most insufferable are those who are willing to purchase peace at any price in matters of religion.

A word like the following from so acute a scholar as Dr. William Brenton Greene, Jr., of Princeton Theological Seminary, is as heartening as it is relevant in these troublous times: "Now, as ever, the best reason that can be given for anything is, 'The Bible says

so.' This is true even in the domain of science. This sphere the Bible seldom enters; but when it does, it is supreme there as elsewhere." Dr. Greene does not believe that true Biblical teaching and true science are opposed, but he does believe that the speculations of men ought to be held in suspense of judgment if they differ from Biblical teaching. And that is the evangelical position.

Let everybody weigh the following words by the editor of *The Presbyterian*: "If the Scriptures cannot be believed and trusted when they tell of the things of nature, of science and history, how can we believe them when they tell about things of the world to come, of God, eternity, of heaven and hell? If a man lies about things within our knowledge, how can we believe him when he tells us of things beyond our knowledge?" Just so! Will not the modernists stop long enough to reflect seriously on the above questions?

The modernists are in error when they define Christianity as a life. That gives it entirely too humanistic an aspect. Moreover, it is that logical fallacy which mistakes the effect for the cause. It ought to be put in this way: Christianity is that body of teaching (doctrine), derived from the Bible, which points out the true way of life and imparts the strength to live that life. Doctrine and life never ought to be set over against each other. A man ought to accept the truth and live in accord with it. A schism between what a man believes and his way of living always involves inconsistency and discomfort, if it does not lead to downright hypocrisy.

We wish to call the attention of those modernists who reject the virgin birth of our Lord to the *Magnificat* of Mary. Let them read over her pure and beautiful song, and then say whether one who could utter such sweet and lofty sentiments could have been a deceiver in regard to the vision and message of the angel of the annunciation. If that which was conceived within her was not by the Holy Spirit, why did she burst out in so fervid and lofty a song of praise? What was the impelling motive of it? Why was it ever sung? Even if Mary did not compose and sing it, who was the impostor who could have composed it and then attribute it to the Virgin Mary? These are serious questions. They ought to give the modernists pause.

Read the opening verses of the gospel by Luke. He says he intends to write about "those things which are most surely believed

among us." Therefore at the time of his writing the virgin birth must have been accepted by the Christian church. Luke also declares that he himself "had perfect understanding of all things from the very first." Then how could he have been mistaken about the virgin birth of Christ? He adds that he is writing to Theophilus in order that "thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." This "certainty" must have included the virgin birth, for Luke straightway proceeds to give the narratives of the visit of the angel Gabriel to Zacharias and the Virgin Mary. If, after such declarations and assurances, Luke did not tell the truth, then, indeed, he must have been an unprincipled deceiver. It would be well for all men to think seriously over this matter.

Why are the liberalists so changeable in their speaking and writing? Why do they so often shift their theological positions? At one time they express themselves in such a way as to lead you to believe them to be veritably evangelical; at another time they will reveal a wide departure from the evangelical faith. The explanation of this kaleidoscopic religion is at hand. The modernists are rationalists; they make limited human reason instead of the Word of God the norm and standard of judgment. History proves that mere reason is a flickering, uncertain light. But the Word of the Lord standeth forever, having been settled in heaven. Therefore the former is a doubtful, changing light; the latter is a bright and steady light.

Read this quotation attentively: "The most timely truth for our day is a reform which will point this generation of evolutionists back to creation and to the worship of Him who made the heavens and the earth. Other reforms in other days have been based on various parts of the Bible here and there. The reform most needed in our day is one based on the first part of the Bible—and upon the last part also. For he who is looking for the return of his Lord, and for the imminent ushering of the new heaven and the new earth, must necessarily believe in the record of the first part of the Bible, which tells of the creation of the earth. Surely it is useless to expect people to believe in the predictions given in the last chapters of the Bible, if they do not believe in the record of events described in the first chapters." The quotation is from Professor George McReady Price's new book, "Science and Religion in a Nutshell."

Professor Price says further: "But the doctrine of the fall of man is just as essential a part of the Christian religion as is the doctrine of Christ's mediatorial work." Then he quotes the following from Mr. Blatchford, the well-known English socialist: "But—no Adam, no fall; no fall, no atonement, no Saviour. Accepting evolution, how can we believe in a fall? When did man fall? Was it before he ceased to be a monkey, or after? Was it when he was a tree man, or later? Was it in the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, or the Age of Iron? And if there never was a fall, why should there be an atonement?" There you have the logical sequence in terse and inevitable form, written out, too, by an infidel. Will the Christian people of our country ever get their eyes open to the logic of evolution? We pray that they may.

We desire to call the attention of our readers to the Association of Orthodox Colleges of California. The constitution has been sent to us, and we have read it with care and great satisfaction. In its Articles of Faith it enunciates belief in all the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, and states them in terse, clear and unmistakable terms. Here is no equivocation, no hiding behind vague words that might be interpreted to mean almost anything. The scholastic requirements are to be as high as those of the most advanced colleges of the land. Free copies of the leaflet will be sent to any address by applying to Dr. C. B. Widmeyer, president of Pasadena College, Pasadena, California. Dr. Widmeyer will also send free a valuable leaflet by Professor Lowell H. Coate on "A New Scholarship Needed." This article was commended by Hon. William J. Bryan. An attempt will be made to form a National Association of orthodox colleges.

* * *

To-day is your day and mine, the only day we have, the day in which we play our part. What our part may signify in the great whole we may not understand; but we are here to play it, and now is our time. This we know—it is a part of action, not of whining; it is a part of love, not of cynicism; it is for us to express love in terms of human helpfulness.—*David Starr Jordan, D. D.*

* * *

"The old, old story in an old, old book is the greatest and best gift ever given to mankind."—*Gladstone.*

THE ARENA

The Bible the Foundation of the American Republic

By Wilbur M. Smith, D.D., Baltimore, Maryland



NATIONS, rising to great power, having attained a place among the kingdoms of the earth, are prone to ignore those ideals, articles of belief, and the lives and labors that went to the laying of the foundations upon which future prosperity and glory might securely rest.

The words of Sir James Alan Park, written more than a century ago, and referring to England, may with equal force be applied to our nation at the present time: "We live in the midst of blessings till we are utterly insensible of their greatness, and the source from which they flow. We speak of our civilization, our arts, our freedom, our laws, and forget entirely how large a share is due to Christianity."

This was the charge which God laid against Israel, "Thou hast forgotten the God of thy salvation, and hast not been mindful of the rock of thy strength." Is America guilty of this sin?

The influence of the Christian religion is the influence of the Bible. "The book and the people have been bound so closely together," says Dr. Warfield, "that we hardly know whether it were juster to say that where Christianity has gone there the Bible has gone. Where the Bible has gone Christianity has gone." Tribute paid to the one is always tribute paid to the other.

Legare, in his *Origin and Influence of Roman Legislation*, says that, "From Constantine's accession, Christianity became the *jus gentium* of Europe, or the basis of the *jus gentium*, according to the definitions of the civilians themselves."

Burke informs us that when the Anglo-Saxons conquered Britain, the Roman law had almost expired. A new code of laws was drawn up by Alfred the Great. Indeed, continues Burke, "by the universal consent of all writers, the Anglo-Saxon laws owe more to the care and sagacity of Alfred than of any of the ancient kings."

If this is true, then how significant is the fact that these very Statutes of Alfred began to

with the sentence, "The Lord spake these words unto Moses," and there followed both the entire Decalogue and a large part of the Levitical law.

The story is told that when Taine caught sight of an old folio, Tyndale's translation of the Bible, he wrote, "Hence have sprung much of the English language, and half of the English manners; to this day the country is Biblical."

The greatest work ever written on English law is the *Commentaries* of Blackstone, and here we find the unequivocal statement, "Christianity is a part of the laws of England." The early colonists were from a nation that was Christian, and from a people that were Biblical.

The very movements of thought which were sweeping Europe in the seventeenth century, and which so radically changed man's conception of government and liberty, ultimately leading to the founding of a new commonwealth in the New World, found their inspiration and support in a study of the Scriptures.

John Fiske never wrote with any visible prejudice for the Christian faith. He called the idea of Biblical Inspiration "a sad incumbrance." He never was able to believe in God as more than an Omnipresent Energy, or an Infinite Power. All the more remarkable, then, is the tribute which Mr. Fiske pays to the element of religion in this movement of European history.

"It is not too much to say that in the seventeenth century the entire political future of mankind was staked upon the questions that were at issue in England. To keep the sacred flame of liberty alive required such a rare and wonderful concurrence of conditions that, had our forefathers then succumbed in the strife, it is hard to imagine how or where the failure could have been repaired. (Had it not been for the Puritans, political liberty would probably have disappeared from the world.) If we consider the Puritans in the light of their surroundings as Englishmen of the seventeenth century and inaugurators of a political movement that was gradually to change for the better the aspect of things all over the earth, we cannot fail to discern the value of that sacred enthusiasm which led them regard themselves as chosen soldiers of Christ.

It was the spirit of the 'Wonder-working Providence, that hurled the tyrant from his throne at Whitehall and prepared the way for the emancipation of modern Europe. No spirit less intense, no spirit nurtured in the contemplation of things terrestrial, could have done it. The political philosophy of a Vane or a Sidney could never have done it. The passion for liberty as felt by a Jefferson or an Adams was scarcely intelligible to the seventeenth century. The ideas of absolute freedom of thought and speech, which we breathe in from childhood, were to the men of that age strange and questionable. But the spirit in which the Hebrew prophet rebuked and humbled an idolatrous king was a spirit they could comprehend. It is to the fortunate alliance of that fervid religious enthusiasm with the Englishman's love of self-government that our modern freedom owes its existence."

Not only were the incentives which prompted the emigration from the shores of England to America rooted in deep religious convictions, but the very ideals and principles which these early colonists held were distinctly and exclusively Christian. We again quote from Mr. Fiske's authoritative study of this epoch of history.

"The aim of Winthrop and his friends in coming to Massachusetts was the construction of a theocratic state, which should be to Christians, under the New Testament dispensation, all that the theocracy of Moses and Joshua and Samuel had been to the Jews in the Old Testament days. So far as possible the text of the Holy Scriptures was to be their guide both in weighty matters of general legislation and in the shaping of the smallest details of daily life. The impulse by which they were animated was a profoundly ethical impulse—the desire to lead Godly lives, and to drive out sin from the community—the same ethical impulse which animates the glowing pages of Hebrew poets and prophets, and which has given to the history and literature of Israel their commanding influence in the world. The Greek, says Matthew Arnold, held that the perfection of happiness was to have one's thoughts hit the mark; but the Hebrew held that it was to serve the Lord day and night. It was a touch of this inspiration that the Puritan caught from his earnest and reverent study of the sacred text, and that served to justify and intensify his yearning for a better life, and to give it the character of a grand and holy ideal."

When the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, in 1620, they signed a declaration to the effect that they had come to found a colony "for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith." The Puritans, a few years later, recorded their determination in similar terms: "We covenant with the Lord, and one another; and do bind ourselves in the presence of God, to walk together in all His ways, according as He has pleased to reveal Himself unto us in His blessed word of truth." In view of such testimonies as these, found on every page and in every undertak-

ing of our forefathers, we see the fairness of Daniel Webster's conclusion, that, "The Bible came with them. And it is not to be doubted that to the free and universal reading of the Bible is to be ascribed in that age that men were indebted for right views of Civil Liberty."

These were aspirations and intentions. What were the actual accomplishments in the early settlements? Did the inevitable hardships of pioneering, and the struggle for existence, destroy these holy desires and ideals in the hearts of the Pilgrim Fathers? After coming to America, did circumstances force them to abandon their original hopes?

A great mass of historical data has come down to us to prove that such was not the case. Take, for example, the difficult problem of legislation in these early ventures. I quote from a valuable work by Julius F. Seebach, entitled *The Book of Free Men*.

"In New England every question was 'discussed, disputed, and cleared up by the Word of God.' And it was not considered settled till it was found 'agreeable to the Holy Scripture.' The New Haven colony, in 1639, declared: 'Scriptures do hold forth a perfect rule for the direction and government of all men, in all duties which they are to perform to God, and men, as well as in the government of families and commonwealths as in matters of the church.' Public officials were chosen according to its direction. Quarrels were wisely settled in harmony with its statutes. Criminals were plied with its precepts to induce a confession, and capital punishment was justified by its commandments. Wars and alliances were considered in the light of Israel's practice."

In the matters of education, the influence of the Christian religion was, if anything, even greater than in the questions of law. Our author states that:

"The chief stimulus in the minds of the Protestant colonists was Biblical. In New England a township containing fifty households was directed to appoint a schoolmaster, and one of more than one hundred households must establish a grammar school. The reason is plainly noted—that men might have a better understanding of God's word, 'it being one chief product of the old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures.'"

A splendid summary of the religious nature of the subjects that were at this time offered in the lower schools is given by Mr. A. B. Ost, in his book, *The Bible and Our National Life*.

"Chief among text books, doubtless the most common and most important in that day, was the Bible. From contemporary sketches of the district schools we find that the Bible, more particularly the New Testament, was generally read twice a day in the upper classes; while under many a teacher it was the only reading in many

of the younger classes. The Bible was the Reader. And even if some others came into use at the close of the eighteenth century they invariably contained portions from the Bible and parts of sermons. Indeed, almost every bit of the contents of readers, other than the Bible, was of a religious, moral, or otherwise serious character.

... Most important among school books was the New England Primer. This book came into being at the close of the seventeenth century and for more than one hundred years was (aside from the Bible) by far the most important book used in our schools. With the exception of the New Testament, it was practically the only book used by the younger classes. Its contents and its extensive use in the schools and in the homes justly gained for it the significant name among the people, 'The Little Bible of New England.' Historians declare freely that the New England Primer has done more to form the New England character than any other book except the Bible."

The history of the great institutions of learning that originated at this time bears in every part and on every page the marks of the influence of the Christian faith. How strange today, yet how precious, reads the second clause of the first code of Harvard College: "Everyone shall consider the main end of his life and his studies to know God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life; John 17:3." Of Yale College the same is true. William L. Kingsley begins the first chapter of his history, *Yale College*, with these words: "A college was one of the institutions which the Rev. John Davenport, the leader of the colony which was planted in New Haven, A. D. 1638, deemed essential to that idea of a Christian state, which he had formed before he left his native land, and to establish which he came to the wilderness of this new world." A recent author is authority for the statement that of the forty-eight institutions of higher education established in America before 1829, thirty-two were church foundations.

Enough evidence has been presented to guarantee the accuracy of the summary which Justice Story makes of colonial life in the period before the Republic took permanent form.

"Every American colony, from its foundation down to the Revolution, with the exception of Rhode Island (if, indeed, that state be an exception) did openly, by the whole course of its laws and institutions, support and sustain in some form the Christian religion; and almost invariably gave a peculiar sanction to some of its fundamental doctrines. Indeed, in a republic, there would seem to be a particular propriety in viewing the Christian religion, as the great basis, on which it must rest for its support and permanence, if it be what it has ever been deemed by its truest friends to be, the religion of liberty."

We now turn our attention to that period of American history extending over two quarters of a century, one closing the eighteenth, and the other opening the nineteenth century. The beginning of this era is marked by the production of two famous historical documents, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. The former, as everyone knows, opens with these words:

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation. We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Where did these early Americans ever come upon this idea of "certain unalienable rights"? How did they know that with these things they had been "endowed by their Creator"? Let me quote from a volume dealing with the entire subject of this document, *The Declaration of Independence*, written by Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, at one time Chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress.

"The theories of natural rights and the origin of government in contract had their use at this time. Men were then more prone than now to seek for evidence of the Divine Hand in the institution of mundane affairs. And as ideas of government, lay and clerical, were receiving earnest study and new application, their origins were sought for in the sacred books. In these were to be found the earliest recorded instances of the genesis of government. With minds open to interpretations that fell in with preconceived views, the covenants recorded as made between God and the Jewish people, were seized upon as proof positive of the contractual nature of the first governmental form."

As to the Constitution, it is true that it nowhere directly sanctions the Christian religion. The First Amendment, adopted in 1791, says, in part, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is admitted by all authorities that Congress was not here intending to assume an attitude of indifference to Christianity, but intended that the questions of religion be separately considered by the individual states themselves. And anyone must be fully persuaded that the states saw fit to so legislate, in a most definite way, if we examine the early state constitutions, as they are collected, e.g., in *The Evolution of*

the Constitution of the United States, by Sydney George Fisher, or Cornelson's *The Relation of Religion to Civil Government in the United States of America*.

Justice Story, whose writings are still quoted in the highest courts, writes, in the second volume of his *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States*, concerning this particular subject, as follows:

"Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it, the general, if not the universal sentiment in America was, that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state, so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience, and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference would have created universal disapprobation if not universal indignation."

For four weeks the Constitutional Convention, at Philadelphia, deliberated and discussed, agreeing upon no single article, and at times, says one historian, causing much angry blood. On the morning of June the twenty-fifth, when the convention was on the verge of adjourning, and abandoning the purpose for which it assembled, Benjamin Franklin arose, and addressed George Washington in the following memorable words:

"Mr. President, the small progress we have made after four or five weeks' close attention and continual reasonings with each other, our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes, is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running all about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government and examined the different forms of those republics which, having been originally formed with the seeds of their own dissolutions, now no longer exist; and we have viewed modern states all around Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable in our circumstances. In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were, in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? . . . I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our project will be confounded, and we ourselves shall

become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, conquest. I therefore beg leave to move: That hereafter prayers, imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service."

While this is not a direct tribute to the influence of the Bible, yet it is indirect evidence of the strongest kind. How, except for the Biblical revelation of God, could such a resolution even be conceived, when in five successive sentences every one of the four assertions made are immediately from the Scriptures themselves? From the day when these words were uttered there was an evident change in the success of the proceedings. Whereas the previous five weeks had witnessed the accomplishment of scarcely anything, in less than three months from this time the entire Constitution had been completed, and the convention dismissed. The God of the Scriptures had a hand in its writing. No wonder that Gladstone felt impelled to call it "the greatest piece of work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

We may conclude the discussion of the Christian elements that entered into the making of these early documents with the opinion of Henry Campbell Black, as recorded in his *Handbook of American Constitutional Law*.

"The saying (that Christianity is a part of the law of the land) is true in this sense, that many of our best civil and social institutions, and the most important to be preserved in a free and civilized state, are founded upon the Christian religion, or upheld and strengthened by its observance; that the whole purpose and policy of the law assume that we are a nation of Christians, and while tolerance is the principle in religious matters, the laws are to recognize that the existence of that system of faith, and our institutions are to be based upon that assumption. The prevalence of a sound morality among the people is essential to the preservation of their liberties and the permanence of their institutions, and to the success and prosperity of government, and the morality which is to be fostered and encouraged by the state is Christian morality, and not such as might exist in the supposititious 'statute of nature' or in a pagan country. The law does not cover the whole field of morality. Much that lies within the moral sphere does not lie within the jural sphere. But that which does lie within the jural sphere and which is enforced by positive law, is Christian morality."

The earlier sessions of Congress began its first session with the reading of the Thirty-

fifth Psalm, a small matter, perhaps, until we remember the great number of political writings which were being highly praised and deeply studied at this time, from which, instead, moral precepts might have been read.

In 1777 a famine of Bibles occurred in the colonies, and the matter was brought to the attention of Congress. This was a time when money had to be carefully spent by the young government, for the Republic was pitifully poor, and had entered a war which it well knew would tax its resources to the limit. Yet so important did Congress consider the matter of a plentiful supply of Bibles in the hands of its subjects, that a memorial was passed by that body, in which it was urged, "that the government take immediate measures to secure twenty thousand copies from Holland, Scotland, or elsewhere, at the expense of Congress."

During the Thirty-second and Thirty-third Congresses, an attempt was made to abolish the office of Chaplain for the Army and Navy, and for the Senate and the House of Representatives. Soon after the Thirty-third Congress was assembled, the following resolution was offered by the Hon. Mr. Dodwell, of Alabama, and was adopted:

"Whereas, The people of the United States, from their earliest history to the present time, have been led by the hand of a kind Providence, and are indebted for the countless blessings of the past and present, and dependent for continued prosperity in the future upon Almighty God; and,

"Whereas, The great vital and conservative element in our system is the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and divine truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it eminently becomes the representatives of a people so highly favored to acknowledge in the most public manner their reverence for God; therefore,

"Resolved, That the daily sessions of this body be opened with prayer."

This from the presidents of our nation. Of the Father of his Country, Bishop Meade of Virginia asks, "Is it too much to say that the communications of no king, ruler, general, or statesman in Christendom, ever so abounded in expressions of pious dependence on God"? In his Farewell Address, Washington said:

"Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Consider the order which he issued at Valley Forge Headquarters, May 2, 1778:

"While we are duly performing the duty of good soldiers we certainly ought not to be inattentive to the higher duties of religion. To the distinguished character of a Patriot it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of a Christian. The signal instances of Providential goodness which we have experienced, and which have almost crowned our arms with complete success, demand from us, in a peculiar manner, the warmest returns of gratitude and piety to the Supreme Author of all Good."

John Quincy Adams, the sixth President, in a letter to his son, wrote, "It (the Bible) is of all books in the world, that which contributes most to make men good, wise, and happy."

When Andrew Jackson, the next President, was on his deathbed, he pointed to the family Bible which lay on the table beside him, and said to his physician, "That book, sir, is the rock on which this Republic rests."

The twelfth President, Zachary Taylor, said, while in office, "Our prosperity and our greatness as a nation, no less than our happiness as individuals, is in direct proportion to our observance of the teachings of that Book in which our holy religion is revealed."

What wonder, then, that Robert C. Winthrop said of the American Republic at this time: "Christianity is as clearly now its corner-stone as if the initial letter of every page of our statute books were illuminated with the figure of the cross."

We will now summon one witness from the outside, whose testimony may significantly support that already offered by those of the immediate locality. Alexis Henri Tocqueville, visited America in 1831, and made an exhaustive investigation of every important institution in the Republic. He was no ordinary adventurer. Professor Flint called him, "by far the most moderate and judicious, profound and comprehensive thinker which France has produced in recent times." In his famous book, written after his return to France, *Democracy in America*, this is what he had to say of the religious nature of our nation:

"There is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America. By regulating domestic life it regulates the state. Religion is the foremost of the institutions of the country. I am certain that the Americans hold religion to be indispensable to the maintenance of republican institutions."

William H. Seward and Daniel Webster

appeared in American political life shortly after this fundamental work had been accomplished, and are by all acknowledged to be two of its greatest statesmen, builders upon the foundation already laid, that the nineteenth century was to produce.

From 1839 to 1843 Mr. Seward was Governor of the State of New York, and from 1849 to 1861, United States Senator from the same State. He served as Secretary of State in the administrations of both President Lincoln and President Johnson. His administration as Governor of New York, says one authority, "has been considered in many respects the most remarkable in the history of the Empire State, and has been regarded by many as having exercised a most powerful influence in shaping the political issues which afterward grew up in the country." Here is the remarkable testimony of Secretary Seward:

"I am asked what is my opinion of the influence of the Holy Scriptures on human society? I do not believe human society, including not merely a few persons in any state, but whole masses of men, ever has attained or ever can attain, a high state of intelligence, virtue, security, liberty or happiness, without them, and that the whole hope of human progress is suspended on the ever-growing influence of the Bible."

Again,

"I know not how long a republican government can flourish among a great people who have not the Bible. But this I do know, that the existing government of this country could never have had existence but for the Bible. And, further, I do in my conscience believe, that if at every decade of years a copy of the Bible could be found in every family of the land, its republican institutions would be perpetual."

The following quotation from Daniel Webster is taken from his famous and brilliant *Defence of the Christian Religion, and of the Religious Instruction of the Young*, delivered before the Supreme Court of the United States, in 1844, in the case of Stephen Girard's will. Towards the close of a dramatic appeal, with all the power of his magic eloquence, he cried out:

"There is nothing that we look for with more certainty than this general principle, that Christianity is part of the law of the land. And where there is any religious sentiment amongst men at all, this sentiment incorporates itself with the law. *Everything declares it!* The massive cathedral of the Catholic; the Episcopalian Church, with its lofty spire pointing heavenward; the plain temple of the Quaker; the log church of the hardy pioneer of the wilderness; the mementoes and memorials round about us—the graveyards—their tombstones and epitaphs—their silent vaults—their mouldering contents—all attest it.

The dead prove it as well as the living! The generation that is gone before speak to it, and pronounce it from the tomb! We feel it! All, all, proclaim that Christianity—general, tolerant Christianity—Christianity independent of sects and parties—that Christianity to which the sword and fagot are unknown—general, tolerant Christianity, is the law of the land."

Now concerning the dangers which are at present threatening the pre-eminent place that the Bible has held in our national life.

A recent writer has discovered that up until 1829, not one state in the Union had passed any laws prohibiting religious education in the schools, and only one state had prohibited the use of sectarian books.

In less than a century the Bible has been shut out from the public schools of a great number of the states, some of them among the largest, and in a number of others its reading has been made optional, which means, in a number of cases, that it is omitted.

The tendency to secularize our school system is not decreasing, but increasing. The last twenty years has seen more unfavorable legislation by the courts and legislatures of various states than during any similar period of time in our history.

Only last year saw the great State of California legally close the doors of its schools to the Scriptures. The decision of the District Court of Appeals, at San Francisco, November 1, 1922, written by Mr. Justice Nourse, reads, in part, as follows:

"While Protestantism may not be a 'sect' in the strict interpretation of the term, the Protestant Bible contains the precepts of many of the Protestant denominations, and 'denomination' is merely another name for sect. Controversies have been waged for centuries over the authenticity of the various translations of the Bible, each sect insisting that its version is the only inspired book. As a result of this controversy, men fail to consider any Bible for its literary or historical value, but bar all from the schools, for fear that their children might absorb some doctrine adverse to the teaching of their own denomination."

To what shallow reasoning and what stupid arguments are these enemies of the Bible driven!

The meaning of such action, and its ultimate bearing upon the life of the men and women of tomorrow should be seriously considered. How to furnish the mind with the collected wisdom of the ages, how to think, and to appreciate the creations of the intellect of men, these things rightly belong to our modern school system. How to work, and to successfully engage in the industrial and mechanical arts, these also belong to the same scheme. The care of the body, the principles

of physiology and hygiene, and the latest developments in physical culture, these, too are proper subjects for the youth of our nation.

But the nurture and development of the soul—this must in no wise receive consideration. Of the God by Whom all things were created, and Who upholds all things by the Word of His power, the students must hear nothing. Concerning the Divine Legislation of Jehovah, as recorded by Moses, even though it is pronounced by all the great jurists of the last two thousand years to be the very foundation of individual and national morality, of this, the teachers must say not a word. How to pray, and Whom to pray to, the young men and women must remain ignorant of these matters.

Yes, said one of the leading journalists of the country, "You may teach the Vedic hymns, but not the Hebrew Psalms; the Greek myths, but not the Hebrew stories; the Proverbs of Rochefoucauld, but not the Proverbs of Solomon; the laws of Justinian, but not the laws of Moses; the fables of Aesop, but not the Parables of Jesus." That part of us which is material, earthy, and transitory, is to be trained to the highest possible efficiency, but the soul, which is eternal, must be starved to death, at least as far as the governments of some states are concerned. Such laws find their consummation in disaster.

A greater master of education than any of those who are assisting in the exclusion of the Bible from our schools would ever claim to be, Dr. Thomas Arnold, has spoken on this point in words well worth quoting.

"Physical science alone can never make a man educated; even the formal sciences, invaluable as they are with respect to the discipline of the reasoning powers, can not instruct the judgment; it is only moral and religious knowledge which can accomplish this, and if, habitually removing such knowledge from the course of our studies, we exercise our thoughts and understanding exclusively on lower matters, what will be the result, but that when we come to act upon these higher points, in our relations as citizens and men, we shall act merely upon ignorance, prejudice, and passion? For notions of moral good and evil of some sort we must have; but if we take no pains that these notions shall be true and good, what will our lives be but a heap of folly and sin? This should be borne in mind carefully; and if these merely scientific or literary institutions appear to us to be sufficient for our instruction, if, having learned all that they can teach us, the knowledge so gained shall hide from us our moral ignorance, and make us look upon ourselves as educated men, then they will be more than inefficient, or incomplete; they will have been to us *positively mischievous*."

And if Dr. Arnold seems too far away, both in time and place, read the words of the late President Roosevelt, who, in an address in 1901, boldly declared the folly of non-religious education.

"A man whose intellect has been educated, while at the same time his moral education has been neglected, is only the more dangerous to the community because of the exceptional additional power which he has acquired. It is an admirable thing, a most necessary thing, to have a sound body. It is an even better thing to have a sound mind. But infinitely better than either is to have that for the lack of which neither a sound mind nor a sound body can atone—character. Character is in the long run the decisive factor in the life of individuals and of nations alike. It is a good thing to be clever, to be able and smart; it is a better thing to have the qualities that find their expression in the Decalogue and the Golden Rule."

But, perhaps someone says: Principles of morality *are* being taught in our public schools. This may be true. But they are taught in a way that utterly divorces the whole question of morality from God and the Christian religion.

A four-page pamphlet, *High School Morality Code*, written by Caroline M. Brevard, and distributed by the Character Education Institution of Chevy Chase, Washington, D. C., contains fourteen articles of moral principle, some extending to two or three paragraphs, and not one word, directly or indirectly, from the Bible, nor one single reference to Him who, by Christian and non-Christian both, is admitted to have lived the only pure and blameless life ever seen on this earth. This is a fair example of the way in which our teachers are attempting to teach morals to those who are entrusted to their care. *You cannot divorce morals from religion. It never has been done; it cannot be done now.*

George Washington said, "reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Matthew Arnold well said that "assuredly of conduct, which is more than three-fourths of human life, the Bible, whatsoever people may thus think and say, is the great inspirer."

Facts are at hand to prove that the absence of religious instruction in our schools is only sowing seeds of anarchy and lawlessness in the hearts of the young, and these seeds are already beginning to bear their fatal fruits. Charles W. Eliot, for forty years the President of Harvard University, is considered one of the greatest educators living in Amer-

ica. At a meeting of Congregationalists, held last winter in Boston, Dr. Eliot confessed that, "*The failure of our public schools to turn out good citizens is conspicuous.*"

Even more remarkable, is the remedy which he suggests. "First, teach the children their duty to parents, brothers and sisters. Then teach the meaning of loving their neighbours. Beyond that is *the motive of putting into their hearts the love of God.*"

And where is this love to be found but in the Book which reveals the only true God, in the Bible? Did Greece or Rome ever put into the hearts of their youth the love of God? Has any civilization of the ages past, will any nation to be born in the ages to come, ever expect to have the love of God in their hearts except where the Bible is studied and honored?

When a Unitarian, a man who has troubled the hearts of many with his writings on the *Twentieth Century Religion*, denying the Biblical miracles, and calling the early pages of Genesis "primitive myths," when a scholar who deliberately excluded from his five-foot shelf of books the very Word of God, when this great figure of American life cries out that the remedy for the failure of our schools is to instill the love of God in the hearts of our young men and women, is it not high time that our states realize the folly of their actions, and repent and turn unto Jehovah?

How sadly do we now see the truth of the words of William Lloyd Garrison: "Take away the Bible, and our warfare with oppression and infidelity and intemperance and impurity and crime is at an end; our weapons are wrested away—our foundation is removed—we have no authority to speak, and no courage to act."

What will be the outcome of this awful wave of godlessness which in many ways is sweeping our country, and the careless as well as deliberate neglect of the Bible? What fruits must America prepare to pluck from such plantings as these? Our nation was built upon foundations which sought their security in the Old and New Testaments. Its beginnings were in an atmosphere distinctly Christian. Its roots found strength in soil that was conspicuously religious. Is it now time to forget all this, and to throw overboard the very Book that has made our nation great? If our foundations are obviously Biblical, is it healthy, is it safe to make the superstructure Godless and pagan? Has the intentional continuation of the Bible as a dominant factor in the affairs and thought of our country any

vital relation to the future welfare, yea, the very existence of our Republic?

Here is the testimony of Edward Everett Hale:

"Apart from its direct claims upon our reverence as the depository of Divine Revelation, we cannot but respect the Bible as the great fountain of our civilization. Strike from the political, moral, and intellectual condition of modern society all that has flowed, directly or indirectly, from this source, and you would reduce European and American Christendom to the state of the barbarous and semi-civilized countries, whose character has been formed, or powerfully influenced, by the Koran, or other religious creeds of the East. The highest historical probability can be adduced in support of the proposition, that, if it were possible to annihilate the Bible, and with it all its influences, we should destroy with it the whole spiritual system of the modern world—all our great moral ideas—refinement of manners—constitutional government—equitable administration and security of property—our schools, hospitals, and benevolent associations—the press—the fine arts—the equality of the sexes; in a word, all that distinguishes Europe and America from Turkey and Hindostan."

This is the prediction of Daniel Webster:

"If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but if we and our posterity neglect its instruction and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us, and bury all our glory in profound obscurity."

And that I may make this point sure, I quote once again from that great modern prophet, Theodore Roosevelt:

"Every thinking man, when he thinks, realizes that the teachings of the Bible are so interwoven and entwined with our whole civic and social life that it would be literally—I do not mean figuratively, but literally—impossible for us to figure what that loss would be if these teachings were removed. We would lose almost all the standards by which we now judge both public and private morals; all the standards toward which we, with more or less of resolution, strive to raise ourselves."

"If it were possible to annihilate," says Dr. Hale; "if we neglect its instruction and authority," warns Mr. Webster; "if these teachings were removed," repeats President Roosevelt. The "ifs" may be omitted, for the time of which these men warned us is not the event of some far-distant future. That which was once a bare possibility has become a glaring actuality. What can we call these decisions to remove the Bible from our schools but successful efforts at annihilation? Mr. Ost says that, in 1917, "the school teachers in New York City discovered 860,000 children in the city without any knowledge of the Bible, and void of all sense of right and wrong." And, after giving the authorities, he continues, "it

is absolutely safe to say that fifty per cent of our population grow up without any religious instruction or knowledge of the Bible." The situation is equally bad in our schools and colleges of higher education. It is not improving; rather is it growing alarmingly worse. Is not this "neglecting its instruction and authority?"

This statement is submitted: *Take the Bible Out of Our Schools and Universities and God is Taken Out of the Lives of Our Young Men and Women.* In the speech of Daniel Webster, before the Supreme Court, from which we have already quoted, is this fearless sentence: "It is idle, it is a mockery, and an insult to common sense, to maintain that a school for the instruction of youth, from which Christian instruction by Christian teachers, is sedulously and rigorously shut out, is not deistical and infidel."

As proof I refer you to an article in the February (1923) issue of the magazine *Education, The Plea Against the Bible in the Schools*, by J. Herbert Blackhurst, Professor of Education in Huntington College, Huntington, Indiana. Note these blasphemous words:

"As in the case of its literary merits, it is here, also, to be regretted that the Bible cannot be used more freely in moral training. I believe, however, that the loss is not as great as we are at first inclined to think; for these moral principles have been so diffused through literature and moral philosophy that they are the common property of all and can be taught with little or no reference to their origin. . . . *Just what value some conception of a personal God has for the future social order is a question for serious consideration. . . .* In a day in which the conception of Deity varies all the way from an anthropomorphic personality to a world of nature regarded as absolutely one, eternal and unchanging, as was held by Spinoza, or an ideal mankind, as was maintained by August Conte, *would we not as teachers feel a little bit dogmatic in lending positive content to the term of God?*" (Italics mine.)

What kind of teachers will a school of this kind, a normal school, turn out into the educational world, to instruct the coming generation of American citizens?

Justice Story said: "It yet remains a problem to be solved in human affairs, whether any free government can be permanent, where the public worship of God, and the support of religion, constitute no part of the policy or duty of the state in any assignable shape."

We would suggest that such a situation no longer remains a problem. Such a State has been attempted within the last decade. A nation has dared to attempt to rid itself of

the Bible and the Christian religion. A government has undertaken to establish itself upon foundations where religion is severely excluded. And, simultaneously, there has arisen a government in this modern world, lawless, murderous, immoral, the horrors of whose regime, and the fearful crimes which it countenances, are hardly believable. These two nations, the one where the Bible is being exterminated, and the other where anarchy and bloodshed prevail, are one and the same. That nation is Russia! Russia displays before the eyes of the whole civilized world the ghastly solution of that problem in human affairs, of which Justice Story spoke, whether a free government can be permanent, where the public worship of God, and the support of religion, are abolished.

The famous Bill of 1870, originated by Mr. Forster, by which the schools of England were made to undergo a radical process of secularization, has had half a century to prove its value. Of these results, we have recently been informed, in an article in the *Century*, for February, 1922, *The Bible in the Schools*, written by the Rt. Rev. James Edward C. Welldon, the present Dean of Durham, and for thirteen years the Headmaster of Harrow School. He finds:

"There has been a growing disregard, if not desecration, of the Sunday. There has been an increasing neglect of public worship, not in one social class, but in all classes. The habitual recognition of Almighty God has been sadly impaired, despite the solemn and awful lessons of the Great War. Materialism in one form or another has permeated, or has gone far towards permeating, British society. But of all the symptoms which patriotic Christian citizens may well regard with apprehension none is so formidable as the alienation of the people from the moral law laid down by Jesus Christ. . . . It is almost literally true that, in such degree as the power of the Gospel has become a waning influence upon human consciences, the moral framework of society has become jeopardized, and now stands ready to collapse."

These conditions, according to Dean Welldon, are not due primarily to an abnormal age, but to the absence of Bible study in British schools.

The evils which threaten to undermine the security of our nation are to be seen on every hand, and are admitted everywhere: the desecration of the Sabbath, the alarming increase of divorce, the extent of lawlessness, the impurity of our social life, the viciousness of our press and periodicals, the prevalence of corruption in various public offices, and the almost utter lack of religion in many of our larger universities. With the decrease of

Bible study and religious training there has come a startling increase of crime and anarchy. It has always been so.

Whatsoever a nation sows, that shall it also reap. The Dark Ages of Europe, the horrors of the French Revolution, the awful condition of Russia, and the fearful dangers that sweep the English-speaking countries, all testify to the irrevocable edict of God, that where He is worshiped and His Word is obeyed, there peace and security and joy abound; and that where a nation turns its back upon Him, there is cursing and anarchy. "Behold, I have set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day: and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known."

Everything confirms the assertion that the Bible was the foundation of our great Republic. Upon this foundation it has been possible to build the most remarkable nation of modern times. The world marvels at the achievement. We stand to-day, as Israel stood, in the height of her glory, in the days of Solomon and Jeroboam. And as then, so now, we have in our midst men with lying lips, who build idols to the achievements and

progress of science and invention, and who then cry out, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."

It was the Lord Jehovah Who delivered Israel from the bondage of Egypt; it is the same God Who has brought us forth out of insignificance into power, and exalted us above all the nations of the earth. It was when Israel forsook her Maker that she wasted away, and fell into captivity. If we also forsake the Lord our God, He will forsake us, and make us an object of mockery and ridicule among the people of the world.

The words of the Lord Jesus apply with tremendous force to our country in this critical hour: "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it."

Cogitations of A Fogy

By W. MacNicholl, D.D., Centerport, New York



IN Booklet No. 3, pp. 31-3, of the *Dearborn Independent* articles on the International Jew, the following sentences appear: "One parallel between the Protocols and the real hopes of the Jews is written in the Common Jewish prophecy that Christianity is doomed to perish. It will perish by becoming to all intents and purposes Judaism; and it will become Judaism, first, by ousting all the doctrines pertaining to the Person of Christ, excising from the Gospels the great 'I am's' which are His distinctive teachings concerning Himself; and secondly, devitalizing Christianity of all spiritual content which flows from a union of faith with a Person believed to be divine. This is the only way it can be done."

A sermon by Dr. Charles F. Aked, in which he divests the personality of Jesus of all supernatural elements, was welcomed by

the Jewish press as "the fulfillment of the prophecy that within fifty years the religion of all the American people outside the Roman Catholic Church would be Judaism in principle even though not in name."

Quoting from *The American Israelite*, "No Jew will conceal his gratification when he finds Christians virtually admitting that liberal Christianity is practically an acceptance of the doctrine of liberal Judaism." Again, "Judaism does not wish the Christian Church to remain Christian. This accounts for destructive higher criticism being *almost exclusively the work of the Jews* although the world has long known them under the guise of German critics."

No person who is acquainted with the origin and development of what is known as the Modernist movement will reject, without careful thought, the foregoing statements. If they are tenable the startling knowledge

should be broadcasted throughout the Christian world, so that the membership of the Protestant churches may be able to distinguish the wolves in sheep's clothing from the true Shepherds—the angels of light who stand in the pulpits to feed the people on the living bread from “the wandering stars for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever.”

A Foul Conspiracy

If the ex-Kaiser's government for forty years, by teaching militarism and atheism, and schooling its youth in inhuman cruelty, atrophied the soul of the German people in order to pave the way for the destruction of world democracy by the might of the German army, so the International Jew for nearly twenty centuries has been assailing Christianity directly and indirectly with the subtlety of the serpent. All the weaponry he could find in the arsenals of perdition has been employed to adulterate and efface Christianity—open violence, sophistry, intimidation, deceit, misrepresentation, malign falsehood, impudent denial of obvious facts, persistent abuse, and last of all, the brutal boycott.

The hatred voiced in the murderous cry, “Away with Him! Crucify Him!” has been assiduously nurtured in every age; and today the Jew, with the mysterious veil still on his sordid heart, is as hostile toward New Testament teaching as were those merciless priests who, on Mount Calvary, perpetrated the blackest crime in the history of the universe.

Anxious to strike at what he regarded the traditional enemy of his race, Wellhausen, the intellectual mastiff, began to bark. He set the other hounds in the Jewish pack to yelping out his anti-Christian venom. After a time the Gentile kennels were awakened by the strange noise, and eager to participate in the hunt for valuable game, without anticipating the baneful consequences to civilization, one by one they emerged to join their Hebrew fellow-barkers. Of course they were welcomed with *eclat*; and profoundly ignorant, presumably, of the wicked plot, and hungry for notoriety, they readily affiliated with their new comrades, and regimented together, they marched ahead vigorously.

History Repeats Itself

It was as interesting as it was painful to see Herod and Pilate again united against Jesus Christ. Was it not a novel spectacle, that of Nineteenth Century Jews and Christian scholars, with the loud-mouthed infidels

and Atheists of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries in the front ranks, all moving in solid phalanx against the citadel of the Christian Faith?

The biological evolution and destructive criticism of this age are but the resuscitated corpses of the unbelief of Spinoza, Voltaire, Renan, Tom Paine, David Hume, and Charles Darwin. Yet these fellows trot out this old nag, caparisoned in attractive colors, as the original creation of the modern mind! Those French and English skeptics were stigmatized as blasphemers and enemies of the Church of God, but they were honorable enough to fight on the outside, and depended entirely on their own financial resources. Their disciples today, (tell it not in Gath) are waging *their* fight from the inside of the fold, and are pleased to baptize themselves as Christian scholars with a modern mind! They receive salaries from the churches and Christian schools while dynamiting the foundations of Christianity! At least so it seems to the writer. Which of these two classes is the more reprehensible—the men who fought in the open as pronounced enemies, or those who today are doing the very same kind of work in the mask of Christianity? To borrow a comparison from two mutually antagonistic organizations: It is as if the Knights of Columbus were waging war against Protestants in the paraphernalia of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan.

This may be considered a severe arraignment of the Modernists, but is it not warranted by the facts? The purpose of the International Jew is to divide the Gentile nations, control the world's commerce and eviscerate Christianity. Hence their persistent cannonade of the Fundamentals, their favorite plan to work by proxy, the strenuous effort to strip the Christ of every attribute of Deity, to eliminate the supernatural from the Bible, and reduce it to the level of other literature, denying to it any pre-eminence over the writings of Pericles, Shakespeare, or Emmanuel Kant. Snuff out the miraculous, from the Holy Scriptures and the Christianity of Christ is dead.

They Know Not What They Do

Isn't the above the program of the Modernists reduced to its last analysis? Do they fully realize the nature of their work? Can they not already identify some of its sad results? Is there any difference between liberal Judaism and liberal Christianity, that is Unitarianism, except in name? Has not the

Jew in a measure succeeded in disrupting the Christian Church? Do not Jewish and Modernist Christian scholars deny the Bible miracles? Are they not perfectly agreed in flouting the Virgin Birth? Is it not true that neither leaves any room in his philosophy for the atonement? Do they not alike invest man with power to work out his own salvation without the intervention of God? Do not both deny the doctrine of original Sin, and consequently do away with the need of the new birth? Do they not locate the ultimate Seat of authority in the human personality rather than in Almighty God? Is not such teaching religious anarchy, making every man a law unto himself? Does it not virtually eliminate the sovereignty if not the personality or very existence of God, thereby opening the highway to anarchy in the State?

If the object of the Jew is to Judaize Christianity, that is to blot it out as a system of supernatural religion, and the purpose of the Evolutionists and higher critics is to establish, what they have dogmatically affirmed again and again, that Christianity like Buddhism and Mohammedanism, is merely the fruit of a process of evolution, working according to laws as unalterable in the moral world as biological evolution operates in the physical realm, then materialistic Jews and so-called liberal Christians are headed toward the same goal. If this conclusion holds the Modernists, whether Christian pastors or professors in theological schools, are helping to consummate the deeply-laid plot of Jewry, namely, to paralyze the Church of Christ, and eliminate the Christian religion. If they do not realize the moral tragedy they are helping to bring upon the world they are blind, and, therefore, incompetent for the task of religious leadership. Yet do they not regard themselves as among the most wide-awake and conscientious people of their age? If they do know what the avowed enemies of Christianity are working to accomplish, and yet persist in their attacks on the Supernatural, they are knaves, not benefactors, and should be classified with Judas and Benedict Arnold. This is a rather harsh criticism, but the outlook for the Kingdom is gloomy. Jesus is being wounded in the house of His friends, and the theological vandals need drastic treatment as well as fervent prayers.

Are They Omniscient?

Who are these champions of intellectual freedom of whom we are hearing so much today? Who are these Modern Goliaths who

dare to defy the army of the living God? What is this modern mind that has been extolling its wonderful achievements until sensible readers are having a feeling of disgust? Is it a prodigy of originality superior to the Almighty Himself? Does it comprehend all the learning and wisdom of the ages? Is it the scientific or philosophic mind it claims to be? Are the people outside this elect circle back numbers and ignorant fanatics? Are they opposed to real scholarship and progress? Has the modern mind explored immensity? Has it discovered absolutely all the secrets in existence, and returned to this mundane sphere to proclaim to its benighted inhabitants beyond a reasonable doubt, that there is nothing incomprehensible, nothing supernatural, in the universe? That a miracle-working God is a fiction of a morbid imagination? That the only God is a pantheistic God, an impersonal force diffused through matter and space? That this orderly cosmos that goes without a jar from century to century, is the work of chance? That the ideas of a Deity incarnate suffering to uphold the rectitude of moral government, the immortality of the soul and a future life, angels good and bad, that all these conceptions are but the freaks of minds distorted by fear or stimulated to dementia by crushing sorrow and yearning love?

Says Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, in a recent issue of the *Methodist Review*:

"The modern mind is something purely subjective. It is an intense hostility toward the Supernatural. It is confused obsession with orderliness in nature that is blind to the inherent transcendence of personality. It is not Science. It is not philosophy. It is simply a mental bias, a sentiment, a subjectivity and nothing more."

Some Modernist Fruit

The Modernists make a liberal use of Biblical terms. They speak of God, Christ, prayer, the Spiritual, etc. They tell us their interpretation of Christianity and the Bible will emancipate the mind from superstition, quicken its forces and faculties, and bring a veritable Kingdom of God on Earth. Amazing! Heretofore, however, many sane people held it responsible for having borne a very different kind of fruit. They charge that it has shaken the faith of many who have not the time nor ability for original investigation; that it has confused and discouraged honest inquirers for the truth; that it has thinned the attendance at the churches and filled the playhouses; that indirectly it has intensified

the gambling craze; that it has weakened the obligation of the marriage covenant, and produced an epidemic of divorces and suicides; that it has debauched the business conscience, and that, true to the merciless law of the survival of the fittest, it has made the weak a prey to the mighty, until the struggle for existence has become well nigh intolerable for millions of our fellow-creatures. A terrific impeachment, truly.

If the God of the Modernists is not a Person with all the attributes of personality, if He cannot, when He considers it expedient, deviate from His ordinary method, if miracles never have been wrought, or if they are impossible, if the Bible is only uninspired literature, if the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount have no more binding force than the Declaration of Independence or a Sunday discourse, if the final standard of conduct is the individual conscience, and that conscience happens to be cruel, selfish, intolerant, and if every man is free to follow his own freaks and fancies, if this be the meaning of personal liberty, if there is not a Supreme Being revealing Himself through an infallible Book, Who has the unquestioned right to adjudicate the affairs of the universe and to give an irrevocable decision on the conduct of every responsible creature, then civilization is impossible and chaos, hell, is inevitable.

The Bible teaches the omnipotence and omnipresence of God; that He is the Unchangeable Ruler of the universe; that He is also a loving Father who will reward every man according to his works. Unless we misunderstand him the Modernist gives us a God destitute of personality, a ruthless force that thrusts us humans into existence without an explanation as to why we were placed here, or whither we are going, leaves us in the midst of a battlefield to take care of ourselves, cannot, or at least does not, come even occasionally to give us respite from the tortures of barbarous law, and permits the weak and defenseless to be devoured by the stronger, and all this without any satisfactory assurance of reward in a life after death. Which of these two Gods—the God who is imminent and loving, or the God who is very far away and indifferent—which of these two philosophies does the Christian reader prefer?

Dogmatism Gone Mad

This overshadowing genius with the modern mind is the supreme dogmatist. No Roman prelate or back-woods preacher could equal him. He has a cast-iron creed. He

affirms that evolution is scientifically true, and brands those who challenge his ex-cathedra decisions as obstinate and ignorant. Yet he advances no data in support of his assertions. He gives bare assumptions and guesses but no facts either from history or the natural world. He appeals to geology, but geologists are as divided in their opinions as lawyers and doctors. He scorns the doctrine of miracles although Old and New Testaments abound in evidence of the Supernatural, as authentic as any other facts in history.

Is he in a position to be dogmatic on these questions? He tells us the earth is hundreds of millions of years old. How does he know?

He denies the Noachian Deluge, the passage through the Red Sea, and the historicity of the Book of Jonah. Has he lived on this planet 6000 years, with reliable agents in all parts of it to report regularly on all the happenings? If not, whence came his marvelous knowledge? What authority has he for the cocksure manner in which he speaks? Is he not a trifle impudent to ask the intelligent people of the Twentieth Century to swallow his scholarly foolishness without gagging in the absence of reasonable or scientific proof?

The phrase is found many times in the Old Testament, "The Lord spake unto Moses," "The Lord God called Abraham and said," "Thus saith the Lord unto Ezekiel," and others. Are these expressions falsehoods? Would holy men write lies and deceive their readers in order to convince them of the existence of the Supernatural and to teach them to be truthful and honest? This would be doing evil that good might come, "whose damnation is just," is the apostolic warning. Shall we believe the men who were on the ground and wrote from personal observation, or the modern critics who know no more about these matters than their long-suffering readers?

Are They Consistent?

They disbelieve the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, and yet some of them say they accept the Divine nature of our Lord. If his humanity was not supernaturally produced, as stated by the sacred penmen, He was not "God manifest in the flesh." Having a human father as well as a human mother, he was born in Sin, and therefore morally unfit to be the Redeemer of our race. He was a sinner Himself, needing a Divine Saviour. If Jesus was not the Son of God by eternal generation He is not the world's redeemer

and the following statements are lies: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of Thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke 1: 35. "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise; when as his Mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, *before they came together*, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." "Behold a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call His Name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us." Matt. 1: 18, 23.

Whom are we to believe—Matt. and Luke who obtained the facts from reliable witnesses only a few years after they occurred, or Harry Fosdick and Stickney Grant, who write their denials nineteen centuries later, and who got their information from the laboratory of their own dogmatic brains? How long would it take a jury of unbiased men to answer these questions?

The Modern Mind Prejudiced

To those who believe in an omnipotent God who created countless worlds out of nothing, which surely was a stupendous miracle, the story of the virgin birth is reasonable. How easy for such a God to create the germ of a human body in the depths of a pure young woman contrary to the normal method. Nothing is impossible to God except that which involves a contradiction of Himself.

What finite mind would presume to measure the resources of the Infinite—to predicate what is natural and what Supernatural? Whatever graces evolutionists may have to their credit, the grace of humility is conspicuous by its absence. If "evil communications corrupt good manners," the men of the modern mind, by absorbing Jewish anti-Christian propaganda, have been seriously unsettled in their belief in the old Book, especially as to its teaching on the origin of man and the Deity of Jesus. If they were evolved from the brute, which they seemingly accept with pleasure, likely they would not object if doomed to return whence they came.

But if they were created by a direct act of God, which they deny, but which the Book of Genesis affirms, and the beast nature is eliminated by the power of the new birth, in that event they would be satisfied with nothing short of the beatific vision.

It detracts from the dignity of man to claim for him a jungle origin. The belief that he

came directly from the hand of God without a long and loathsome evolutionary process, should stimulate him to an earnest effort to secure his God-appointed destiny.

Materialistic and Theistic Evolution

The Materialistic Evolutionist is a blank atheist. He denies the being of God and the soul of man. The Theistic Evolutionist believes in God but rejects Old and New Testaments as a revelation of Him. He treats the doctrine of the Holy Spirit with scorn.

In fact the man with the modern mind never speaks of the Holy Spirit at all, feels no need of His illumination, is sufficient of himself to discover the truth, and therefore not only consigns to the scrap-heap the doctrines of atonement, regeneration, and the guiding Comforter, but has lost adequate motive for prayer; for if there is not a God of love who hears and answers prayer, and the laws of the universe are inexorable and inflexible, which admit of no deviation or suspension no matter what the emergency, prayer is nothing but a hollow mockery, a useless waste of breath, and God Himself is a helpless slave to the very laws He has ordained.

Furthermore, the Evolutionist must be shaky on the immortality of man, and perhaps does not care much whether there be a future life or not. If he has a sufficiency of material comforts here why worry about a future world?

But the man who believes in his personal accountability, and in the permanence of personality, is the man who will use the last ounce of his vital force not only to improve social conditions, but to save people from their sins. If death ends all, man, with his noble aspirations and expectations, is an inscrutable mystery, and this life is the tragic experiment of a God who is either incurably stupid or infinitely more cruel and wicked than the devil.

Concerning Religious Experience

If there is no supernatural how are we to account for the phenomena in the sphere of religion? They are facts and must have a cause, as the effects in the physical world must have had a cause. The conversion of a bum or atheist is as much a legitimate subject of investigation as the healing of a paralytic or the restoration of vision to a blind man. Was there nothing supernatural in the vision that changed Saul the persecutor into Paul the Christian? Could such a complete transformation in a man with his colossal intellect

have been effected by a mere hallucination? A scholar and logician like Paul hallucinated, hypnotized? What is your honest answer Mr. Modernist?

Were the three thousand Jews converted to Christianity on the Day of Pentecost hypnotized? Did they not remain changed, and did they not gladly toil and suffer to the end?

How about the harlots, inebriates, thieves, assassins, agnostics, many of them of a high order of intellect, who are brought into the Kingdom of God through the rescue missions and evangelistic efforts of today? Can these transformations of character and life be explained without the intervention of the supernatural? Can human wrecks like Samuel H. Hadley and Jerry McCauley be changed permanently into sons of God by an unassisted act of the will? The idea is preposterous.

If the preachers of an unalterable natural order, who fancy they know all things, would dispense with their conceit and engage in agonizing prayer, a demonstration would be made to their spiritual faculties which would shatter their philosophy, and turn them from theorists and dreamers into soul-winners who could help to wrench the gates of hell from their hinges. Will they follow the heavenly vision or will they continue to dash their speculative brains against the rocks of intellectual pride and unbelief until summoned before Him whose Godhood they deny and whose plan of salvation they spurn?

My Decision

As for myself, by the grace of God I shall remain unshaken in my loyalty to the great Christian beliefs. Without fear or shame, fog or no fog, I declare myself to be a Fundamentalist. I shall fall or stand with Jesus Christ. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby they can be saved."

I expect to read what the critics may have to say as far as my time will permit. The portals of my mind are open to the four quarters of the earth. I shall gladly welcome truth, from any quarter, but have no room for rubbish however attractively it may be prepared for distribution. The word of the Lord has always been my daily food, and ever will be. The joy I find in the humble service of the Kingdom is like a crystal river that carries my doubts into the ocean of forgetfulness.

Evolution, whether founded on scientific fact or fiction has never saved nor fed a Soul.

The liberals have never yet driven one brigade of Satan's army from the field of battle. As well expect gaudy air-balls to reduce the Rock of Gibraltar. But faith has "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, and put to flight the armies of the aliens."

It is better to have the mind of Christ than the modern mind. Old things—even old fogies—are not useless because they are old. The dear old sun, the law of gravity, the human anatomy, are still in the effective ranks. Better be regarded as a back number and secure a front seat in the heavenly temple, than be applauded as a scholarly leader of modern thought and fail to reach the Golden Gate. Better be with John Wesley than with Charles Darwin. I would rather help to rescue the perishing than help to decoy them to the Niagaras of destruction. Better feed one soul on the bread of life than starve a whole congregation on the husks of Evolution. Better be a saviour of the people than a brilliant writer of books that will unsettle faith and chloroform the conscience and be relegated to the heap of forgotten rubbish.

Blessings on the clear-headed Christian scholars like the editorial staff of the BIBLE CHAMPION who deal in the unadulterated truth, inspire and strengthen the discouraged workers in the sweltering harvest-fields and are waging such a splendid war on the fooleries, the perversities, the sophistries, the unforgivable treacheries, and the disgusting egotism of the men of the modern mind. Their black fortress is slowly crumbling under the God-inspired cannonade. May God have mercy on these present day Scribes and Pharisees who prefer corn-cobs and strychnine to nutritious food.

Let those who are, wittingly or unwittingly, attempting to Judaize and paganize Christianity return, if they wish, to their native jungle with its orang-outangs and slimy monsters; let them walk slowly, however, and meditate on the fearful malediction found in Rev. 22: 18, 19.

As for me, I am headed the other way, and can sing the song of Christian hope, "My heavenly home is bright and fair."

These possessors of the modern mind who are turning aside from their legitimate work to dynamite the Rock of Ages, might profit by the suggestion published in the August issue of the CHAMPION, made by Arthur Brisbane to the ex-Kaiser, who is preparing to furnish the world with a brand new Bible: "The wise thing would be to leave the Bible, the

Rocky Mountains, and the ocean as they are, and select other things for revision and improvement"; such as rotten politics, profiteering, and debauched journalism. The oldest

and newest Book in the world, together with its Author, will abide.

The hammers break, the anvil stands."
"Hammer away ye hostile bands,

The World

The World-System



ET us now consider the World-System with respect to its Head, and its Scope.

We must here emphasize, what has before been simply stated, that the world, as disapproved kosmos and aion, is in possession of Satan, and is ruled over by him. There are very many who look upon the Devil when offering Christ "all the kingdoms of the kosmos" (Matt. 4: 8), for an act of worship to himself, as a grand fraud, offering what he did not possess. Not so. The world-kingdoms *are* his. We have Christ's own testimony for it, John 12: 31; 14: 30; 16: 11. Three times does He declare him to be "the Prince of this kosmos." St. Paul, 2 Cor. 4: 4, says he is "the god of this aion." And St. John says, 1 John 5: 19, "the whole kosmos lieth in the evil one."

Precisely in the fact of the Satanic possession of the world-kingdoms lay the force of the temptation. Satan offered to abdicate, if the Son of God would render him a moment's homage. Had He paid the price, and had Satan's proffer been in good faith, our Lord would have secured thereby the absolute and immediate vanquishing of all kinds of evil upon the earth; and the anguish of the strife, the waging of the battle that has since been, and is to be ere Satan is vanquished, would have been prevented. Surely, *that* were something to be desired. But for so great an achievement Jesus would not commit the moment's sin.

It is needless to add that the offer was not made in good faith; and had it been accepted, Satan would have triumphed over the Son of God, by craft bringing the Second Adam under his power as he did the first. Had it not been for his headship of the world-system, and over the world-system, and over the world-people, his proffer would have been no temptation. He is Head.

The World-System, in its Scope, is most extensive and complete. It embraces the governmental arrangements, the politics, of the world. To paraphrase a familiar political

saw, government is of the world-people, by the world-people, for the world-people. True, "the powers that be," governments, "are ordained of God" (Rom. 13: 1), but Satan has usurped them. They are not administered for the people of God, except as He overrules them.

It embraces the "business" of the world. Cain, after the murder of Abel, went out and founded a city, and, with his descendants, gave himself to handicraft, commerce, art, science, "culture." The development of what we call "civilization" was, and has been, in the Cainitic line. Business, with its selfish graspings, its competitions, its syndicates, its trusts, its strikes, its strifes internal, external, and I had almost said eternal—doubtless eternal in the sense of aeonic, age-lasting—is manifestly of "the world that lieth in the evil one" (1 John 5: 19).

It embraces "society." Social order, so called, with its arrangements of rank, caste, class, position, quality, blood; social disorder, with its dissatisfactions and jealousies, its strivings to get up at the cost of pulling somebody down, its multitudinous vices which must here be nameless, is the product of "the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life," that are "of the world". (1 John 2: 16).

It embraces—shall I say "religion"? It certainly includes very much that passes under the name of religion. All false religions are its own. The tares, sown by the wicked one among the wheat, belong to it. Not a little that is in the domain of the Church is confessedly of the world. We err in confounding religion with Christianity.

Politics, business, society, religion—may not all be comprehended under these terms?

Moreover, every one that is born, is born a world-person, under the world-system. The world-system takes him and seeks to provide for him from the cradle to the grave. To every instinct, to every need, to every taste, to every aspiration, the world has something to offer. Be the outgoing political, social, or religious; professional, mechanical, or commercial; educational, aesthetic, or carnal; for

fashion, for amusement, for fame,—it matters not what—the world-system has something to meet it. To every human faculty the world brings something to satisfy it—no: I will not say “satisfy” it, but occupy and busy it, so that the man may be kept from breaking away from it, and finding what his heart craves and what the world cannot afford, and *that is God!* Satan, the head of the world-system, would himself be God!

This may seem, to some, altogether too comprehensive and sweeping. Possibly it may even be called “pessimistic.” Let us refrain from epithets and seek the truth, and that, too, not from our own inner consciousness or wishes, but from God’s Word. If kosmos and aion have the meanings which our exe-

gesis has deduced—and surely we have not read meanings into them, but have fairly deduced their meanings by the scientific inductive method—then I see no stopping short of the length to which we have gone.

Such, then, is the World-System as to its Head and Scope. And when we consider what it is, its mighty power, its varied provision for human wants, its pleasing bestowments, its enticing proffers, its seductive promises, its bewitching allurements, does it not seem a wonder that its thrall over its own should ever be broken, and its power be overcome?

NOTE—This is the third of a series of eight articles on “The World,” by Dr. Bates. The first appeared in the May issue. The fourth will appear in the August issue.

Similitudes of the Christ, Joseph and Jesus

By Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D., Middletown, Delaware



ESUS was often understood and described by the similitudes of Nature, such as, “I am the Vine, ye are the branches;” “I am the Light of the world;” “I am the Bread of life;” “I am the good Shepherd.” Our Lord also compared Himself with characters in the Old Dispensation, saying, “Behold, a greater than Solomon is here.” “Behold a greater than Jonas is here.” He also asked his disciples, “Whom do men say that I, the son of man, am?” They said, “Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some say Elias, and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.”

It is true that we realize the unknown and unseen largely by visible illustrations. Nature is a book of pictures of Godlikeness. The noblest human characters have been considered types of the Christ, but we would not compare any man with the Divine One in the sense that both were on the same level, for Jesus had no peers. In His creative and redemptive glory, He stands in the solitary grandeur of a God. It is therefore no less than blasphemy to consider Christ no more than one of the best of mankind. Our similitudes, therefore, will be considered on the human side.

Joseph was one of the most worthy characters the world has seen. There was no blot recorded upon his life. His father Jacob at certain times returned evil for evil, while Joseph forgave his enemies. Once, Abraham falsified to the Egyptian monarch, but Joseph was true. Moses lost his temper when he

struck the rock, but Joseph waited patiently in prison for vindication. Solomon worshipped the false god of his many wives, while Joseph, under greater provocation as a ruler among the Egyptians, was faithful to the God of Israel. David fell under the fascinations of a woman, while Joseph resisted the temptress.

In tracing the similarity of the life of Joseph with that of Jesus, we see that Joseph was a special favorite with his father which created great jealousy among his brothers. Reuben, having forfeited his birthright as the firstborn, it was given to Joseph, the firstborn of Rachel, and the beautiful coat was a symbol of his elevation. Jesus, the only begotten son of the Father, was given the pre-eminence over all creations and all beings. Joseph was called of God by dreams to a great mission. Jesus was called to the mightiest mission in the history of the universe. Joseph was always true to follow the will of God; Jesus said, “I delight to do Thy will, O God!” Joseph suffered from the hatred of his brothers, was sold into slavery and, on account of cruel falsehood, was cast into prison. He endured the separation from his home and friends and native land, the pains of dungeon darkness and chains, the loneliness of isolation and misrepresentation, but, through it all, he believed God, expected deliverance, waited for the morning. Jesus was glorified through His sufferings. He left his home in heaven for earthly poverty and want. He came unto his own, as Joseph did to his brothers, but his own received him not. They said, “If we

slay him, the inheritance will be ours." They hunted him, maligned him, hated him, and at last, crucified him.

Joseph found the pit and the prison the golden steps to the throne of Egypt. Jesus found his humiliation his exaltation. The manger, the flight into Egypt, His life of sorrow, Calvary and the sepulchre were steps to power. Joseph was sold for twenty pieces of silver; Jesus, for thirty. Joseph had a revelation that he should become a ruler, while Jesus saw down the ages the fruition of the travail of His soul, and was satisfied, for He is to reign over all kingdoms. Joseph, under the most terrible temptations, maintained an unsullied character; Jesus was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. Joseph was the divinely appointed savior of Egypt in the times of famine, and consequently, of his father's family and of the whole house of Israel, maintaining the line down to the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem. He helped make the prophecy true, "Out of Egypt have I called My Son." Jesus was the divinely appointed Savior of mankind, who were starving for the heavenly manna.

Joseph showed the Christ-like spirit when, as premier of all Egypt, his starving brothers bowed before him. He thought of their hatred, animosity and crime. He knew they had been the cause of all his misery, as well as of the sorrow of his father, Jacob. The natural heart would have gloated over the opportunity for vengeance, but Joseph provided for the needs of his cruel brothers before they knew he was their wronged brother, and, when at last he was revealed to them, he fell upon their necks, embracing them, and freely forgave them all. So Jesus cried out on the cross to his persecutors, "Father, forgive them!" Joseph shed tears of affection over his brethren as Jesus did over Jerusalem. Joseph was not ashamed of his brothers before the court of Pharaoh, though the Hebrews were hated by the Egyptians. He ordered his father and the family to come and dwell in Egypt, that they might be provided for during the famine. Jesus is not ashamed to bring the greatest sinners into the company of the holiest in heaven. The weakest, neediest, and poorest, he loved most and best.

Joseph was so true to Israel that he believed in a great future for his chosen people. When he came to die, at the age of one hundred and ten years, after being in Egypt eighty years, he said, "God will surely bring you out of this land unto the land which he swore unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." Jo-

seph gave commandment concerning his bones, saying, "Ye shall carry up my bones from hence." So Jesus sees the triumph of the people of His kingdom, for they will come unto the Canaan of everlasting rest.

Joseph's name is perpetuated through all time, and will be as enduring as eternity. So Jesus' name is above every name. Jesus did not ally himself with royalty or wealth, but with the despised of all races. So Joseph refused the glories of the Egyptian empire.

Through the forty years of wandering in the wilderness, the coffin of Joseph's remains was an inspiration to the faith of Israel. They believed that at last they would reach the Promised Land. Joseph had believed it and proclaimed it. He had waited for centuries for burial—why should they not wait patiently a few more years. Jesus had waited nineteen hundred years for the kingdom of this world to become the kingdom of our Lord and Savior. His body and being have been borne aloft to the heavenly Canaan, not for burial, but for everlasting life. Joseph saw the hand of God in his whole life. When his brothers asked his forgiveness, he said, "Fear not, for I am in the place of God. As for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it for good." Jesus not only knew the Father was ever with Him, but that He had given unto the Son all power, wisdom and rule, all judgment, all thrones and kingdoms.

As Joseph's brethren were guilty in their betrayal of him, so mankind is verily guilty in the betrayal of the Elder Brother, Christ. Our sins have caused the shedding of innocent blood. Shall we not plead with Jesus for the salvation of our loved ones, as Judah did with Joseph for Benjamin? Oh, how eloquent that plea! Judah says, "His father loveth him. When I come to my father and the lad be not with us, seeing that his life is bound up in the lad's life, it shall come to pass that he will die. Now, therefore, I pray thee, let thy servant abide instead of the lad, a bondsman to my Lord, and let the lad go up with his brethren. For how shall I go up to my father and the lad be not with me?" Oh, that the church of Christ felt thus responsible for those in bondage of sin, crying out, "How shall I go up to my heavenly Father and the loved ones be not with me?"

Joseph revealed himself to his brethren by exclaiming in the midst of tears, "I am Joseph whom ye sold into Egypt." Jesus reveals Himself unto men as He did to Paul, saying, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." The

tones of loving kindness trembled in these words of recognition, of forgiveness, of abounding compassion and of overwhelming love. Jesus calls us brethren, friends, followers, heirs to His infinite inheritance and to

His eternal fellowships. Who among earth's millions can refuse such love?

"If I ask Him to receive me,
Will he say me nay?
Not till earth and not till heaven..
Pass away."

A Balanced Ration

By Lawrence Keister, D.D., Scottdale, Pennsylvania



EDICAL men advocate a balanced ration in the interest of health and long life. Food taken into the body should contain the elements required and in the exact proportions. This scientific and sensible program aids assimilation and all the physical functions. It means health of body and vigor of mind.

Plainly we must go one step farther and have a balanced ration for the entire man. Being composed of body and spirit, both parts of our nature must have their appropriate nourishment in order to insure our well-being.

Moses taught the Hebrew people to feed the spiritual as well as the physical man. Jesus has spoken to a larger audience laying down this convenient working formula, "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." These two great leaders are in agreement when they speak of bread for the body and the word of God for the spirit and without change their teaching has stood the test of centuries of experience.

The word of God is not offered to men as a bone of contention but as a means of sustenance, not to unbalance men but to give them poise, not to belittle and shorten life but to enlarge and lengthen it. It serves the same purpose for the mind and heart as bread for the body.

Jesus acted on this principle when he refused to betray his higher nature for the sake of the lower. Satan tempted him to exalt the body above the spirit, but Jesus was not deceived and misled as so many men are. He asserted the reality of the spiritual and maintained its superiority over the physical. Without disparaging the physical he assigned its true value to the spiritual.

Satan would make life irrational while Jesus rationalizes it. Let men take heed. Let them not speak complacently of themselves as rationalists when they are really irrational. Jesus was not induced to sell his birthright and men who follow him place the same esti-

mate on their higher life. What Jesus stood for in presence of the tempter and what Moses taught the Hebrew people gives us the true balance as between the two parts of our nature.

When bread is appropriated and assimilated it is carried into every part of the body to construct or reconstruct its tissues. In like manner the word of God is appropriated and assimilated by reading, that is, by taking it into the mind; by meditation, that is, by relating it to personal experience and personal need; by prayer, that is, by claiming the assistance of the Spirit of God in interpreting and applying it. The word of God thus enters the spiritual circulation and courses through the inner life refreshing every faculty and sustaining every power.

Children require food that is similar to that of their parents because they inherit the same nature. Animals have their own diet and in so far as a man is an animal he requires food adapted to his digestion. In so far as he is more than an animal he requires food they know not of.

Men should show themselves as more than creatures. Are they not the offspring of God? Are they not the children of God? They have the breath of the divine life and can be partakers of the divine nature. They must therefore have food to sustain their higher life for unlike God they are neither self sufficient nor self-sustaining. They require truth and wisdom and love as these continually proceed from the divine mind. They can exist for a time without intentionally receiving the word of God, but they cannot live as they ought to live.

Jesus and Moses are right, man cannot live by bread alone. He is too high in the scale of being to feed on the lower level. He requires the word of God, every word that proceeds from him.

Men take the liberty to select from the menu God places before them. They show a distinct dislike for some of the words God

has spoken and a narrow preference for others. The Pharisee of old chose his duties to suit his own convenience and omitted the weightier matters of the law.

Some men in our own time are content to emphasize one mode of baptism and overlook the baptism of the Spirit.

Some insist on regeneration and then forget that conversion is not merely an event marked by time and place, but above all the beginning of a life.

Some assert that Christ's presence is manifested in a consecrated wafer, a material thing, though Jesus teaches us that God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.

By choosing some words of God and refusing to receive others, men show a bias of mind from which they must be saved. Every word has its value and the one they desire least may be the one they need most to balance them as moral and religious beings.

The words that I speak unto you, says Jesus, are spirit and life, just what men require, life of which their nerves are scant and spirit by which they are allied with the supernatural, and hence we conclude that since men are not as wise as God they cannot safely reject any word he has spoken.

The words of our Lord have in them his spirit and his life for they emanate from his mind and heart. He lives as man lives and also as God lives and in the harmony of his life he brings to us the principle of our perfecting. As we become more godly we become more manly and *vice versa*. There is truth for us day by day as well as daily bread. The word of the Lord which endures forever continually refreshes us and renders us restful. Heaven and earth shall pass away when they have served their purpose, but the words of our Lord shall not pass away and these are the words by which our spirits live.

An artificial observance of the Sabbath called forth Christ's correction, the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. It was made to minister to his entire being, his body which needs this periodic rest and his spirit which needs this regularly recurring relief from ordinary occupation and this opportunity to open itself to God in order to receive his teaching and commands and promises, all of which proclaim his relation to God as the one being on earth on whom he can bestow his love and from whom he can receive a fitting response.

The child in the home lives by the word of

its parents, receiving affection, instruction, direction, and are not Christians the children of God? Scientists prescribe a balanced bill of fare for our bodies, but God gives us a balanced ration for our dual natures, bread for our bodies and his word for our souls. He who is a Spirit offers us his word as the only food of beings whom he teaches to address him as "Our Father who art in heaven."

Wisdom and Wit from Spurgeon



SOME time ago David Lloyd George delivered an address on Charles Spurgeon. It is given almost in full in *The Watchman-Examiner*, of New York, and is good reading for preachers and laymen alike. As a specimen of Spurgeon's wit and wisdom, we reproduce the following paragraphs:

Then here is another very good phrase, when he tells his students to avoid being too flowery. There is no man who had a greater gift of using poetic language, but it was used with great restraint. He said: "You must not wrap garlands round your swords." It is a great saying. He was down on long prayers. He said: "Fancy a man praying for twenty minutes, and then asking God to forgive his shortcomings!" He also advised his students not to preach long sermons. He said: "Some sermons remind me of the sailor who was told to pull a rope on board. He pulled and pulled until he was tired, and then declared that he believed 'the end o' this 'ere rope is cut off.'" Then he said to them: "There are some people who can't stop, even when they have really finished, when they have nothing more to say," and he said it reminded him of the captain who ordered his company to fire a salute, and they answered: "We have no more ammunition, sir." "Then," he said, "cease firing." "That," said Spurgeon, "is my advice to you." Talking on the same subject, he said, a boy was asked why the eunuch went away rejoicing. He said: "It was, sir, because Philip had finished his sermon."

He gave advice on very practical questions. He was very emphatic about the letter *h*. He said it must not be dropped. He talked about a man quoted in the Scripture. "Many there be who go in thereat," and saying, "Many there be who go in their hat." That is a good way of impressing things on the minds of students. That is the whole point. He was not jesting merely in order to make jokes; he wanted to put things in a way which would not be forgotten. Here is another good bit of advice; it shows how practical he was. "If you are called upon to preach in the afternoon, be careful what you have for dinner. If you eat half a leg of pork you won't feel much divine assistance. A man full of pudding is not very likely to be full of power. The process of digestion won't help your sanctification." That is very sensible, as every public speaker knows perfectly well.

THE SANCTUARY

"The Disciple Whom Jesus Loved"

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado

Texts, John xii. 23; xix. 26; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 21.



GOING into a bookstore shortly after the book came out, the proprietor handed me a beautiful and dainty paper-covered little volume entitled "The Greatest Thing in the World." The phrase was intended to be descriptive, not of the book itself, but of its subject. The volume contained Professor Drummond's discourse upon the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. With marvelous power and clearness he made very plainly to appear the fact that the greatest thing in the world is *Love*.

If love is the greatest thing in the world, *to be loved* is the sweetest thing in the world. Were affection to be withdrawn from us and we stand unloved and alone, surely continued existence would be a curse. It is love, if anything, that makes life worth living.

Love is reputed to be not able to give a very good account of itself. It is alleged to lavish itself, if with rhyme, yet without reason. The classic poets represent it to be blind. But surely the greatest thing in the world cannot be an unreasonable thing. Whatever others may see, or may not see, it must act with a reason that is satisfactory at least to itself. It seems quite unthinkable to me that true love should violate the nature of things.

I confess myself unable to see any reason why God should love a corrupt and wicked world as He does, when it deserved only justice and judgment, giving his only Son to die for it; but surely there must be a reason which He sees, and which is perfectly satisfactory to him.

Jesus took into his infinite heart all mankind when he yielded himself a sacrifice, becoming a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world (1 Jno. ii. 2). But the love that prompted this sacrifice seems to have been a general and indiscriminating love. It took humanity *en masse*.

While it is the nature of love to love largely and with mighty sweep to gather all into its all-embracing folds, still it is consistent with love, as we know, to love specifically

and discriminatingly. Jesus loved all the apostles; but of the apostolate there were three—Peter, James, and John—that he treated with special favor; and one of the three, John, is described as pre-eminently "the disciple whom Jesus loved." This phrase is used of no one else. With Jesus' example before us, I do not know that we should feel called upon to apologize for having favorites. Only let us not fail to love *as* he loved. His was not an excluding love. It was not that he loved the other apostles less, but John more. A favoritism that excludes, or that unjustly discriminates, violates love.

With respect to John, must we not assume that there were reasons for Jesus' special love for him? I think there must have been traits in John's character that pre-eminently evoked this love of Christ; and I think, too, that Jesus loves every disciple with precisely such love in proportion as the Johannine traits are possessed.

I covet such love for myself. Do not you? What a joy would fill my heart, would fill yours, could it be said of us distinguishingly, "A disciple whom Jesus loved."

Five times in his gospel does John make this characterization of himself, each time under a different set of circumstances, and as though the circumstances gave occasion for the characterization. Studying these, perhaps we may find some of the traits which win Jesus' special and distinguishing love, and so, possibly, we may be helped to acquire the same, or to increase them if we already have them.

1. The first time John is thus characterized is in chapter xiii. verse 23, in the last supper scene. "Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom *Jesus loved*."

These words and the circumstances under which they were written, speak to me of *intimate fellowship*. Jesus has special love for the disciple that is in intimate fellowship with Him.

With but one exception—(*metoche*, 2 Cor. vi. 14)—the English word "fellowship" translates in the New Testament a single Greek word—(*koinonia*, 12 times out of 20)

—which means partaking, sharing, having in common.

We understand well what human fellowship is. We do not have fellowship with strangers, or with acquaintances whose tastes and aptitudes are alien from our own, but with our friends, those whose tastes are like ours. Our fellowship with them is in the things which we have in common. The business man has business fellowship with men engaged in the same business, or in other businesses in which he is interested. The scholar has fellowship with the scholar in his line of studies. The philanthropist has fellowship with those interested in his schemes of philanthropy. The Christian has fellowship with those interested in Christian things, and most of all with Christ.

Do you know that this matter of fellowship is an infallible test of a man? What his heart fellowships, that is he. When a man finds his accepted and acceptable companionship with the non-Christian, the intemperate, the profane, the Sabbath breaker, the enemies of Christ, he thereby declares where he belongs. A man is known by the company he keeps. Birds of a feather will flock together.

All the disciples had fellowship with Jesus, but John's was intimate fellowship. He lay *on* Jesus' heart because in sympathetic oneness he was already *in* Jesus' heart. If we were to compare *in*, we would say in, inner, inmost. The Latins, lacking a positive, have the comparative *interior*, and they go a step, or steps, further to the very center with the superlative *intimus*. That is the word from which our word *intimate* is derived. John was so at one with Jesus that he was at His heart's center. Why did not Peter at the last supper himself ask Jesus the question as to who the betrayer should be, instead of motioning to John to do it? He doubtless thought there was that in his character—as his subsequent denial proved there was—that would not permit him to come into the inner chamber of Jesus' confidences. John asked the question, and he alone received the answer (xiii. 28, 29). Intimate love could ask, and intimate love receive the response.

Do not you love those who love what you love? and love most those who most love what you most love? How you naturally gravitate to them in fellowship. Are you in sympathy with Jesus' glorious objects of good for the world, identified with him in his work and purpose of grace for men, aye in love with him just for what he is in and of himself?

Such, I fancy, was John's relation to Him, and therefore Jesus loved him.

We often speak of fellowship with Christ in prayer. There is such fellowship, and blessed it is. But this fellowship of which I now speak is something nobler and sweeter than prayer, especially when prayer is narrowed to the limits of confession and supplication. What would be thought of a wife who never sought the presence of her husband except to ask for a gift, or of a child who never came to the father unless forced to acknowledge misconduct, or to present a request for help? A minister was one day busily engaged in his study, and desired to be free from interruption. Quietly the door was opened, and he looked up somewhat impatiently to see what the intrusion meant. His wee girl toddled into the room, and he said, "What do you want, little one?" "Nuffin', papa," she replied, "I jess want to be wid 'oo." Of course books and papers were dropped, and in a moment she nestled in his bosom!

My hearers, just where are we as to this intimate fellowship with Jesus? What joy, what blessedness must be in this close relation! May He bring us into it, that we may have that love of his which he bestows upon intimate fellowship.

2. The second time John is characterized thus is in chapter xix., verse 26, at the crucifixion scene. Jesus is on the cross. At its foot he beholds his weeping mother. Though agonizing beneath the weight of a world's woe, he still has thought for the human filial relation. Probably bereft of her husband long years before, and now bereft of her Son, to whom shall she be committed for care? "When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by whom *he loved*, he saith unto his mother, 'Woman, behold thy son!' Then saith he to the disciple, 'Behold thy mother!' And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home."

I here see in John *trustworthiness*: he was one to whom could be committed a grave responsibility in confidence.

I should esteem it a mark of great honor if one in the agonies of dissolution should select me before all others and commit to me a sacred trust, indeed the most sacred trust which he had, and which I was to administer as long as I lived. No man would commit to me such a trust unless he believed me to be trustworthy, and the more implicit his confidence the more would I feel myself honored.

One who would thus trust and honor me, I am sure would love me.

What an important trait in human character is this element of trustworthiness! Solomon tells in Ecclesiastes vii. 28 that he found only one man in a thousand he could trust, and not a single woman. Well, I do not wonder at that, considering the sort of women he associated with. He in his degradation had got a good ways below the point where any confidence could be reposed in him, and the people he found down there would be apt to be of his sort. Destroy not my faith in humanity by saying no one, or only one in a thousand, is to be trusted. Have you not seen men, many of them, and women too, yes, and more women than men, to whom you would commit in restful confidence, everything you possessed? But it must be confessed that the number is by no means so great as it ought to be. God forgive us wherein we have failed.

This element of trustworthiness, of downright, incorruptible, unshakable honesty, of unremitting and unswerving faithfulness, is something every one of us ought to covet and cultivate. When our confidence in a man is gone, it is as though the bottom had fallen out, and our faith drops as into a bottomless pit. How our affection goes out to a man that we can tie to; and how we love him, when, in time of need, we have tied to him and found him unmovable! How one who pulls straight and true every time, and under all circumstances, wins our confidence!

In permitting us to make a Christian profession, Jesus has honored us with a great trust. In giving us a place in his church, and among Christian people, yes, and before the world, he has committed a grave responsibility into our hands. Did we deserve his confidence? Have we so carried ourselves in faithfulness to him and his interests as to win his love? Would he now be justified in committing a dying legacy into my hands—into yours? Friends, in the discharge of every obligation that we have assumed or under which we rest—our promises, our pledges, our vows—obligations of every sort, let us be true and faithful always, and by our trustworthiness merit the confidence and love of all, and most of all of Jesus.

3. The third time John is thus characterized is in the post-resurrection scene, chapter xx., verse 2.

In the glinting of the earliest dawn, while it was yet dark, came Mary Magdalene to

the sepulcher—how she must have loved the Lord to have visited his grave alone at such an hour!—and she found it empty. “Then she runneth”—this is the record—“and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom *Jesus loved*, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulcher, and we know not where they have laid him.”

Here I see John to be a person *so identified with Christ that one who is in trouble goes to him.*

It is true that Peter is also named, but only because he is in John's company; for surely a man who had so recently denied his Master with cursing and swearing would not be one to whom anybody would go when in sorrow because of being bereft of that same Master.

John, above all others, was the man Mary was hunting for. He had so absorbed Christ's love and had become so possessed of his spirit that Mary in her grief instinctively turned to him now that her Lord was gone.

In sorrow, and especially in bereavement, any human sympathy is sweet. Many of you know well about that. I remember well our own loss when Jesus took our little firstborn, and how I have treasured up in memory every kindness, either in word or deed, shown us then. Though years have flown by on swift wing, I still have a wondrous tenderness in my heart for those kind friends. I remember very well the class of people to whom I instinctively turned.

And I have, too, a vivid recollection of a liquor seller to whom deaths in his family brought great sorrow. I wondered why he did not turn to his own kind, the drunken and the profane, for sympathy and help. But no: he turned at once to the church and Christian people that he had before so much abused. Not the voice of blasphemy or the presence of the blasphemers, but the voice of prayer and the presence of the faithful Christian, did he want in his home. The explanation of this must be, that, sweet as any human sympathy is, only that which has *Christ* in it can most meet the soul's need, and lead up to that of Christ himself, which alone can effectually heal the heart's wounds.

Let us suppose here are two people, young people, young ladies, say, both professing Christians: the one bright, gay, hilarious, the center and life of every frolicsome throng, her face turned to worldward ways; the other bright, cheery, but thoughtful for Christian things, seeking not her own pleasure but

others' good, her back toward worldward things, and her face catching the glow of the Saviour's approval as it is turned lovingly toward him. Which one of these professing Christians will her companions turn to when trouble comes? Young lady, which one of these characters would you rather be? Which one *will* you be? We need not ask which one it is that wins the love of Jesus.

And I wonder if every one of us does not court this characteristic of tender-hearted, sympathetic, Christly helpfulness that shall lead the weary, the grievful, the stricken, to turn to us when trouble comes. Such a disciple Jesus loves.

4. The fourth time John is characterized thus is in chapter xxi., verse 7, in another post-resurrection scene.

The disciples seem to have been completely dazed by the unexpected and disastrous ending of Christ's career. Though he foretold them of his death and gave some explicit directions as to what to do (Mk. xiv. 28; xvi. 7; Lk. xxiv. 49), they apparently forgot all about them, and seven of the disciples went back to the old business of fishing (Jno. xxi. 2). They toiled all night and caught nothing. Through the mists and dimness of the early morning a voice breaks the stillness, and calls out from the shore, "Cast the net on the right side of the ship and ye shall find" (vs. 6). They did so, and caught a haul so great that they were unable to draw in the net. Here was a notable thing, the like of which was beyond any experience they had known. John's quick instincts solve the problem. "Therefore that disciple whom *Jesus loved* saith unto Peter, 'It is the Lord.'"

Here we see in John a man of *quick spiritual perceptions*.

Did John discern Jesus with his head, or with his heart, or with both? Both probably, but I think more with the heart than with the head. Jesus' love had imparted to him a heart sensitiveness that made him very quick to perceive love's presence.

We are told that all things shall work together for good to them that love God (Rom. viii. 28). Our minds may assent to the fact on the authority of divine revelation; but that will do us little good unless our hearts perceive and receive the truth. In proportion to the love of the heart for Jesus will we be quick to perceive Jesus in the events of life. What a light and a brightness come into our experiences, especially those shrouded in mists and dimness, when we can look into them and see and say, "It is the Lord"!

"In each event of life, how clear
Thy ruling hand I see,
Each blessing to my soul more dear,
Because conferred by Thee."

My hearer, is your relation to, and attitude toward, Jesus Christ such that you have quick perceptions of his blessed presence? Surely he must love the disciple whose perceptions are quick to see Him everywhere.

5. The fifth and last time John is thus characterized is in this same chapter again, xxi., and verse 20.

It is in connection with, or rather follows, this fishing scene. The disciples come to land. Jesus has a repast ready for them, fish cooking upon the coals, and bread. Then he gives Peter the three-times test, "Lovest thou me?" He foretells Peter's death, and adds the injunction, "Follow me." Says the record, "Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom *Jesus loved* following." Peter asks, "And what shall this man do?" Says Jesus, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou Me." The disciples gathered from this that John should not die, but should tarry until Jesus comes again. He seemed to stand transfixed with the glow of the coming glory. He, in his writing, connects the fact of Jesus' special love for him with the fact of Jesus' promised return.

Here I see John to be one so identified with Christ as to have his soul illuminated with the coming of Christ.

I am glad that in my Bible studies, my mind has been led to recognize the place and proportion which this coming event has in the Scriptures, and accordingly should have in our faith. Do you know that upon an average, at least one verse in every twenty-five of the New Testament; apart from the Book of Revelation, has to do with Christ's coming the second time.

Death is not Christ's coming. Death is no friend of mine: it is the penalty of sin. I used to try to fortify myself against the fear of it by inoculating myself with thoughts of it beforehand, on the principle that medical art seeks to mitigate certain diseases through forestalling their action by adopting them in mild forms into the system by inoculation. But it still remained the penalty of sin, the last and greatest enemy of mankind. The Scriptures put Christ, my best friend, in the place of my worst enemy, and bid me look, not for the coming of *it*, but of *Him*. Said he to his disciples, "Take ye heed, watch and pray, . . . for ye know not when the Master

of the house cometh" (Mk. xii. 33 *et seq.*). And he adds, "What I say unto you I say unto all, 'Watch.'"

At the close of the first chapter of First Thessalonians we read that the Thessalonian converts "Turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven." The attitude of the early church was an attitude of expectancy, an attitude that continued until less than two hundred years ago, when Daniel Whitby (1683-1726), a Church of England clergyman, but a Unitarian, devised what he called a "New Hypothesis," which he claimed to be a "New Discovery" in biblical interpretation, and in which he put the return of Christ at the close of the 1000-years millennium instead of at the beginning as the Scriptures do, and so, as this view came to be accepted with its necessarily attendant views, the attitude of the church was changed, and Christians ceased to watch and wait for His return. The effect of this upon the spiritual life of the church was most disastrous. It turned out as Christ said in Luke xii. 45, servants that said in their heart, "My Lord delayeth his coming," began to beat the men servants and the maid servants, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken. A worldly church was the result. Friends, we may set it down as true that we cannot do anything unscriptural, either wilfully or ignorantly, without damage to spiritual life. Let us conform to the Word, both in our thought and in our deed.

Have you ever been away from home upon business or a visit, with promise of return but at an uncertain time? What would be your feeling toward those of your family who desired and were waiting and watching for your coming, as compared with those who had no thought or care for your return, indeed wished you would stay longer away, and perhaps not return at all? Ah! you know which ones you would love with a special love. Those whose face brightened and whose pulse beat quicker at the thought of your approach would have place in your inmost heart.

John was the only disciple that stood by Christ when he was on trial before Caiaphas, the high priest. I can easily imagine that he who leaned on Jesus' bosom at supper, who was faithful to him in troubles when all others failed, would most have his soul illuminated with the faith and hope of His coming again. Surely such an one would be a disciple that Jesus would love.

Thus we have seen John to be 1. One who

was on terms of intimate fellowship with Christ; 2. One who was trustworthy, and to whom could be committed a grave responsibility in confidence; 3. One to whom others in trouble would go; 4. A man of quick spiritual perceptions; 5. One so identified with Christ as to have his soul illuminated with the hope of His coming. Truly, "a disciple whom Jesus loved"!

As we have gone along, have you noticed the striking fact that all the occurrences where this expression is used, are connected with the death or the resurrection of Christ? Back of them all, and in which they all inhere is the Cross. You have seen Holman Hunt's picture, "Jesus of Nazareth"? The day's toil is done. The Son of the carpenter is wearied with his work. The tools are laid by upon the bench. The sun is setting. The weary man stretches out his arms in his fatigue, and just then the golden glow of the sunset slants through the low window, bathing the outstretched form in mellow light, but throwing upon the opposite wall in the background the dark shadow of the cross.

The cross is everywhere. It is laid upon your life, and upon mine. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain, waiting for the coming redemption, when there shall be deliverance from the bondage of corruption in the glorious liberty of the sons of God (Rom. vii. 21-23). Let us cheerfully bear the cross, knowing that a crown awaits, which our Lord the righteous judge shall give us at that day; and not unto us only, but unto all them also that love His appearing (2 Tim. iv. 8).

The Crowns of Scripture

I. THE CROWN OF REJOICING. 1 Thess. ii. 19, given to those who lead souls to Christ.

II. THE CROWN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. 2 Tim. iv. 8, given to such as love Christ's appearing hereafter.

III. THE CROWN OF GLORY. 1 Pet. v. 4, given to faithful pastors and such as minister to the flock.

IV. THE CROWN OF LIFE. James i. 12, Rev. ii. 10, given to the martyrs, and to those who through love to Christ resist temptation.

V. THE INCORRUPTIBLE CROWN: 1 Cor. ix. 24-27, given to those who keep the body under that they may please Christ.

What these saintly crown-wearers do with their crowns. Rev. iv. 10.

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

By A. William Lewis, D.D., Long Pine, Nebraska

Peter, of Bethsaida, was the recognized Apostle to the Jews. We need not compare him with Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles; but it must be acknowledged that this special mission of Peter has not succeeded as has that of Paul. Jesus recognized Peter as a leader. He surnamed him Peter. He drew from him the great Confession. He took him to the Mount of Transfiguration, as the spokesman of the three. The Christians recognized Peter as their leader, in the Upper Room, in the election of the successor of Judas, and in dealing with Ananias. The angel delivered him from Prison.

Peter the Impulsive

Matt. 16:21-28

Peter was the most impulsive of the twelve, even to rashness. What tales his mother could have told of his boyhood! After he became a follower of Jesus he was caught in a storm on the Sea of Galilee. Though he was afraid just like the others, as soon as he knew that Jesus was coming to them, he called out, "Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee on the water. And He said, Come. . . . When he saw the wind, he was afraid." Matt. 14:28.

Peter was just as impulsive in giving his opinions and advice. When Jesus said that He must go to Jerusalem and be killed, "Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from Thee Lord!" Imagine! Again in the Upper Room, the last night before the Crucifixion, he said to Jesus, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." John 13:8.

Peter acted as rashly as he felt. In the Garden of Gethsemane, "Simon Peter having a sword drew it and struck the High Priest's servant, and cut off his right ear." The servant was not to blame. John 18:10. Much later at Antioch Peter dissembled, and was rebuked by Paul "before them all." Gal. 2:11.

Peter made rash promises even to Christ. Just after leaving the Upper Room Jesus warned the disciples against failing Him. "Peter answered, If all shall be offended in Thee, I will never be offended. . . . Even if I must die with Thee yet will I not deny Thee." Yet that very night he denied Him thrice. (Matt. 26:35.)

Peter was impatient with Jesus. "Why cannot I follow Thee even now?" "Lord, whither goest Thou?" John 13:38. When Jesus asked him "Lovest thou me more than

these?" Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, "Lovest thou me?" John 21:17. Peter seeing John, "saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do?" John 21:21.

Peter was reckless even in the matter of reverence. On the morning of the Resurrection of Jesus, John reached the empty Tomb first, but reverence held him back; but Peter pushed by him, and entered. John 20:6. Although Jesus charged His disciples to wait for the promise of the Father, the gift of the Holy Spirit, yet Peter exhorted the hundred and twenty disciples to elect the successor of Judas Iscariot. He did not wait for the Holy Spirit; and Matthias was chosen. We all know that he was not really the twelfth Apostle, but Paul.

Peter Remade

John 21:15-23

Peter was the "raw material" of a very great man; and God made him over. The ore of true manhood was refined so that self-sufficiency was driven out of his life, and Christ-sufficiency took possession. Thus he was saved from the degradation and ruin that befell King Saul, the son of Kish.

Peter was a born leader of men. He was energetic, quick witted, with exceptional initiative. He from the first became the spokesman of the twelve disciples. While the others were thinking what was best to be done, Peter acted. He was just in his element when ordering others, and he gloried in his self-appointed position as the ringleader.

Jesus recognized the wonderful possibilities of Peter, and saw the special features of his preeminence; but he saw also that he was not a safe leader. He lacked one essential. His vision was beclouded by self esteem. His

actions were reckless because of lack of breadth of ideals. He was presumptuous because he overestimated his powers. He was self-centered, and the only salvation for him was to become Christ-centered.

Jesus saw that there was only one power that could bring Peter into spiritual alignment with Himself. He planned His appeal. After Peter had fished all night and caught nothing, Jesus gave the disciples a full net of fish, and a warm breakfast on the beach. Many committees today are following the same program, before making their appeal. Then Jesus spoke directly to Peter. "Simon, son of John, *lovest thou me more than these?*" He knew that Peter felt his superiority over the others; so He asked him if he *loved* more than the others loved. The love of God in the soul of man is man's only salvation and his only power to give worthy preeminence. Peter was not to think supremely of his own leadership, or of his own happiness, but of *others*. "*Feed my sheep.*" And so Peter was *remade*.

Peter the Preacher

Acts 2:14-36

Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost opened the Christian Campaign for the conquest of the world. In it we may find the secret of Peter's success as a *preacher*.

Peter had a message. Some preachers talk at random, hopping from one twig to another perch. They are like the boy chopping down a tree, but hitting everywhere except where he hit before. He stuck to his text.

Peter had a message that his audience needed, though they did not want to hear it. Some say the pulpit has lost its power because the preacher talks on newspapers and books, which are open every day of the week. Peter had a message that brought a new life to every one that received it. That day three thousand were added to the Christian group.

Peter preached Jesus Christ crucified and risen. There is no other Gospel. "Repent ye; and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." The vital message is not merely that Jesus lived and died and rose again, but that He becomes the personal saviour of all that accept Him, by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. "To you is the promise, and to your children, and to *all that are afar off.*"

Peter's sermon would have fallen lifeless to the ground had it not been for the work

of the Holy Spirit. Peter preached the Holy Spirit, and he trusted in the Holy Spirit; and to the Holy Spirit absolutely must be given the credit for the success of the sermon.

Peter the Writer

1 Peter 5:12-14

Peter believed in writing letters, and he wrote them. Today we enjoy this privilege, raised to the tenth power. Yet how many neglect this "gift of God"! We can write letters on a typewriter, and we can send them to the ends of the earth, for almost nothing. We may write articles in the religious Magazines and Weeklies, and Secular Dailies; and these go into millions of homes, carrying a blessing, if we put the blessing in them.

Peter's two letters were "circulars." They would be reduplicated by scribes, and forwarded leisurely to the Jewish Dispersion in many lands. (1 Peter 1:1.) Circular letters are overworked these days; but in Peter's day they were highly esteemed, when they really contained helpful truths. Peter put into them the same Gospel that he preached, Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit. (1 Peter 1:12.) "This is now, beloved, the second epistle that I write unto you; and in both of them I stir up your sincere mind by putting you in remembrance." (2 Peter 3:1.)

Preaching, under favorable conditions, has a greater effect at the time than the written truth, but memory is unreliable and feelings are evanescent. Besides, it is true that the eye brings a stronger impression to the brain than the ear; and the printed word keeps the truth unchanged for future reference. The wise reader marks the most helpful passages in books, and clips for preservation the worthy paragraphs in the fire-lighting newspapers. The wise author writes what will always be a blessing to any reader. The Bible is the classic example of the worth of the written Gospel. The earth was cursed by the Dark Ages, because the Bible was hidden. The world is being evangelized these days by the Bible.

* * *

Men tell us sometimes there is no such thing as an atheist. There must be. There are some men to whom it is true that there is no God. They cannot see God, because they have no eye. They have only an abortive organ, atrophied by neglect.—*Henry Drummond*.

LIBRARY TABLE

Reviews of Recent Books

By Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

Postmillennialism and the Higher Critics. By Andrew Johnson and L. L. Pickett. Glad Tidings Publishing Company, 207 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. Price, \$1.50.

The writer of this review does not intend to state any views, *pro* or *con*, on the millennial doctrines. It is not necessary for him to do so in order to commend this book. Every one must admit that the Pre-Millenarians hold fast to the Bible, and are among its most powerful defenders. They show no quarter to the rationalistic treatment of the Word of God. The authors of this volume take that stalwart position, and for that reason all evangelical believers must respect them.

Moreover, they are not among the soft-pedal brethren, who want nothing but peace and harmony, sweetness and light, even with enemies right within the camp. In their foreword they make the following frank statements: "We have no apology to offer for the fact that this book is polemical and controversial. The Bible itself is controversial. Church history is full of polemics. Paul disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus by the space of two years. This was a long-drawn-out debate. We should not hold our peace when enemies have slipped into the fold and are perverting the truths of the Book."

These are brave words, and can be endorsed by all sincere believers, whether they are *Pre* or *Post* in their views of the second coming of Christ. We believe that this book should be read with the open mind. While it strongly upholds the premillenarian doctrine, it gives many a *coup de grace* to the liberalistic critics of the Bible, such as Rall, Mains and Eckman.

God's Book Speaks for Itself. By Charles C. Cook. George H. Doran Company, New York. Price, \$1.25 net.

A wholesome and effective book is this one by Mr. Cook. It is built on the solid principle that the Bible is its own best interpreter. The author stands four-square for the plenary inspiration and complete integrity of the Bible. He sets himself explicitly against those who would hack the Book to pieces. And yet there have been various dis-

pensations in the giving of the Bible. Perhaps some people—and good people, too—would not agree with all the author's statements and positions, and yet he presents his views with much force. The Old Testament is fully inspired, all given of God; yet it was given for a certain age, a peculiar people and a particular dispensation; hence it cannot be the guide of life for Christians in the new dispensation, for they are not under the law, but under grace. Valuable as are all parts of the Old Testament for our instruction and admonitions, there are many injunctions in it that are not applicable to Christian people today. They were not intended to be. As an example, the author cites the law of the Jewish Sabbath, which had attached to its infraction the penalty of death. The New Testament itself (see the epistles of Paul and the letter to the Hebrews) teaches that in Christ many of the Old Testament requirements, having been fulfilled in Christ, have been abrogated. If Christians, therefore, would only distinguish what is temporary from what is permanent and eternal in the Bible, they would be spared much perplexity. This book will be most helpful as such a guide.

The Influence of the Bible. By Thomas Tip-lady. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago. Price, \$1.00.

The author loves the Bible deeply. He has noted its transforming power on the battle field as well as in more ordinary circumstances, for he is the writer of that notable book, "The Cross at the Front." Not only does he pay his own tributes to the Bible throughout this book, but he quotes widely from others, among them the most noted writers of all Christian countries. The book might be called a thesaurus of tributes to the beauty and power of the Book of books. Without being controversial, he stands firmly for the Bible in its integrity. In one place (p. 25, 26) he says that evolution is responsible for the fallacy that human progress is inevitable, whereas the facts are that there have been and are today many instances of deterioration. He also thinks (pp. 41, 42)

that the fall of Germany is largely due to that country's giving up of the Bible for Darwinism, which led to the philosophy of Nietzsche. This is good testimony from one who reveals so little of the polemical frame of mind. We have only one criticism to make. In his opening sentence the author says that the Bible "was written by a race." He means the Hebrew people. The Bible itself teaches that it was written by divinely inspired prophets and apostles chosen for that purpose, and not by the Jewish people themselves, who often fell into idolatry and had many times to be rebuked and punished. Perhaps the author means that the Hebrews as a people were more responsive to divine revelation and instruction than other people were, and that is true.

Master Missionary Series: The Romance of the Pioneers. Edited by W. P. Livingstone. George H. Doran Company, New York. Each, \$1.35 net.

Under this general title George H. Doran, New York, (in connection with Hodder and Stoughton, London), are issuing a most engaging series of biographies of missionaries. Each of them deserves a lengthy review and all the praise that can well be given to a book. Although we must be brief, we assure the reader that he will not be disappointed in any of the books. They are better reading than fiction, because, while they are just as interestingly written, they are true, and that fact lends them a real thrilling human interest. "Chalmers of New Guinea" has already been noticed in preceding paragraphs.

Next comes "Mackay of Uganda," by Mary Yule, who follows her hero, Alexander Mackay, from his rather romantic childhood through all his years of preparation and his subsequent labors, adventures and sacrifices in East Africa. There were strange experiences with the natives, days of persecution, and plots and counterplots; but through them all the marvelous faith and courage of the missionary stood the fiery test. What real heroism and self-abnegation for the love of Christ and human souls!

If you get started reading the next book, "David Livingstone, the Master Missionary," by Hubert F. Livingstone Wilson, you will not want to lay it down until you have reached the last word. It is a fascinating story, told in a fresh and attractive way. Additional interest attaches to the book from the fact that the author is the grandson of the great missionary whose biography he writes,

and is himself a missionary in the historic spot in Africa where his illustrious grandfather died. Thus the book is from the pen and heart of an author who has had access to first-hand sources of information. The narratives of adventure and the descriptions of the peculiar customs of the natives are absorbing.

"Ion Keith-Falconer of Arabia" is the title of the next book of the series, written by James Robson. With fine appreciation and graphic skill the author relates the unique story of this missionary among Mohammedans. Keith-Falconer was a Scotch nobleman, with all the advantages of rank, wealth, mental brilliancy and worldly advancement in his own country; yet he went to Arabia to carry the gospel to the strange people dwelling there. He did not live long to carry on the work to which his life and talents had been dedicated, but his works do follow him. His story is a most attractive and inspiring one.

An effective book for mission study circles, Bible teachers and, indeed, all who are interested in the kingdom of Christ is the story of "Arthur Jackson of Moukden," told in a graphic and sympathetic way by Mrs. Dugald Christie, who is herself a missionary in the same section of China where her hero labored and died. While Jackson's career was brief, it was intense and influential, so that it can be said truly that he did not live, labor and die in vain. Here is a lesson of devotion that will infuse the spirit of the unselfish service into many hearts. While his untimely death—so it seems to us in our shortsightedness—was a missionary tragedy, we may well say of him, "He, being dead, yet speaketh."

God's World-Program. By Grant Stroh. George H. Doran Company, New York. \$1.50 net.

It is both comforting and uplifting to know that God has a plan for the world and the human family. Therefore our world is not one of confusion and chaos. Professor Stroh makes this fact plain in his illuminating book. Nor does he leave us to human guesses at what the divine program is, but goes to the Bible, and from its inspired pages makes many of the most important articulations of the program perfectly clear. God's program began back in eternity; thus He knew what He was going to do; He did not leave the matter to mere fortuity. In the creation of the universe and of man He began to carry His plan into execution, and therefore both were constituted in accordance with His definite purpose, because He could see the end from the begin-

ning. Men may delay the carrying out of this intention, but they cannot thwart it. Mr. Stroh goes into prophecy, and upholds the pre-millennial doctrine. Perhaps others might give this one point a different interpretation, but all Christians will agree that the Bible teaches clearly that God will ultimately succeed in carrying out His program and that the *finale* will be as satisfying to His people as it will be glorious. Professor Stroh is an instructor in Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, which is sufficient guarantee that he is evangelical in his positions.

The Holy Spirit and the Virgin-Born Body of Jesus. By Rev. Herbert Mackenzie.

This is a 16-page booklet which treats of the Virgin Birth from an unusual view point. We have not seen anything more cogent or satisfactory. It deserves wide circulation. Price 5 cents a copy, 50 cents per dozen. It may be procured from the author, 10828 Orville Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.

Down Through the Ages: The Story of the King James Bible. By Frank E. Gabelein, A.M. The Macmillan Company, New York.

It would be hard to find a better book on the Bible than this one. We give it our heartiest endorsement. If everybody loved the Bible as the author does, and would accept the salvation therein offered to all, what a different world this would be! The aim of the author is to show the providential preservation and mission of the Bible down through the ages, and most admirably does he make good that purpose. The chapter on the wonderful way in which the integrity of the text has been preserved, in spite of all the mutations of time and place, and the persecutions it has had to endure, is a strong apologetic in favor of its divine origin and character. The author shows how much better the Bible is attested by ancient manuscripts and versions than are any of the works of classical writers. And yet only a few erratic souls here and there look upon the works of Homer or Herodotus as forgeries. A chapter is devoted to the early versions, such as the Septuagint and the Vulgate. Then follows the story of how the Bible came to England. This is followed by descriptions of Wyclif's translation, the contribution of the Renaissance, the translation of Tyndale and his followers, and finally the King James version. A couple of chapters on the Bible as the pinnacle of literature and as the product of divine inspira-

tion bring the book to a fitting and climatic close.

Additional Book Notes

An informing booklet by Professor George W. Ridout, D.D., of Asbury College, Wilmore, Ky., comes to hand, with the title, "The Present Crisis in Methodism." Everybody who wants to know what is going on in that denomination (and others as well) should get this brochure. It is a clarion call to arms, although only weapons of a spiritual character are to be used. Dr. Ridout proposes an organized crusade, composed of both laymen and ministers, against the false teaching that prevails so largely in his denomination. In the latter part of his booklet, Dr. Ridout exposes the rationalistic and un-Methodist teaching of a number of books included in the course of reading for Methodist preachers. In spite of the action of the General Conference several years ago, under the leadership of Dr. Paul H. Sloan, the commission has retained these books. Thus the liberalist will not even heed the authoritative commands of their highest church judicatory. Is it any wonder many people feel that this so-called "Modernism" in the church is identical with anarchism in the state? The book is published by the Pentecostal Publishing Company, 523 South First Street, Louisville, Ky.

The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va., and Texarkana, Tex., have issued a tract entitled "Verbal Inspiration," written by Rev. W. R. Henderson, D.D. It is an excellent presentation of the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible. The discriminations are acute, so that you can see the difference between true verbal inspiration and mere mechanical inspiration. The distinction between spiritual illumination and Biblical inspiration is sharply drawn. Alleged errors are dealt with effectively. It is one of the strongest presentations that has yet come to our notice.

A "Bird's Eye View of the Book of Exodus," by Henry C. Buell, is just what its title indicates. Almost at a glance you can see the whole contents of this important book of the Bible. It contains a map of Bible lands, an outline of the book, the story of the book told in a graceful narrative, a diagram of the tabernacle, and a question book at the end. The same kind of a booklet on Genesis has been issued. The series is entitled "Synthetical Bible Studies." Price, ten cents per copy;

\$1.00 per dozen; \$7.00 per hundred. Bird's Eye View Publishing Co., Long Beach, California.

In these days when the religious world is so greatly disturbed by false religious teachers and interpreters of the Scripture, and when enemies of all religion are shaking the faith of many people, we are glad to recommend an 80-page booklet, "The Messiah According to the Old and New Testaments," by B. A. M. Schapiro, Manager of the Hebrew-Christian Publication Society, 83 Bible House, New York. It is a "harmony of Christianity." This is the plan of the book: On one page is given what the Old Testament says about a cardinal Christian doctrine; on the opposite page the New Testament teaching is given. Could anything be more helpful than that? The booklet will be sent without charge to any applicant. Address the above-named publishing society.

It is impossible to give a critical review of "The Coming Man of Destiny," by John L. Shuler, issued by the Southern Publishing Association, Nashville, Tenn. Price, 25 cents. The Man to whom reference is made is described as "a herald of the one great Leader who will bring universal and eternal peace to the world." The book is a very earnest presentation of what the Bible teaches regarding the second advent of our Lord to restore all things and bring them under His dominion, so that sin, suffering and strife will end forever. There is no other hope for the world's redemption.

A sermon entitled "What is Christianity?" by Rev. John F. Carson, is worthy of the highest commendation. This able evangelical minister will publish a series of sermons during the year in booklet form. In these days it is gratifying to hear this clarion voice which gives forth no uncertain sound. You can send for a sample copy, or remit \$1.00 for the whole series, and they will be sent you as they are published. Address as follows: Pulpit of the Central Presbyterian Church, 260 Jefferson Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Of course, you will want to read both sides of the current issues that are creating so much debate. George H. Doran Company, New York, have issued a booklet entitled "Science and Religion: Evolution and the Bible." Its authors are Harry Emerson Fosdick and Sherwood Eddy. Dr. Fosdick contributes two essays, "Progressive Christianity" and "Evolution and Mr. Bryan." Dr. Eddy's

essays are "Science and Religion" and "Evolution and the Bible." The authors' attitude of mind is indicated by the order of the terms in the titles: "Science" is put before "religion," "evolution" before "the Bible." The type of mind represented by these men is certainly puzzling. In one place they laud the Bible to the skies; in another place they discredit it by declaring that it teaches the crudest kind of errors. How can a God-given Book, intended as man's directory for time and eternity, contain such a welter of truth and error? Both men proclaim loudly that "the Bible is not a text-book of science." Who holds that it is? But when a God-given Book does refer to the natural world, it surely ought to say the truth, especially when it teaches that God is its Creator, Preserver and Redeemer.

All well-posted persons are acquainted with Dr. W. L. Baxter's capable work, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice," in which he gave an effective reply to Wellhausen and all his camp-followers and which has been so highly commended by Joseph Parker and A. H. Sayce. Dr. Baxter has just issued a brochure of great value, entitled "Smooth Stones out of the Brook, or How to Meet the Philistine." It was written to be helpful to the host of young believers and inquirers who desire to be loyal to the Bible, but who are disturbed by the dissecting critics of the day of the Driver-Kent school. Thoroughly equipped for his task, Dr. Baxter handles the more recent critics with the same masterfulness with which he dealt with Wellhausen's theorizing some years ago. He has lost none of his acuteness; indeed, the passing years have made him all the more skillful in picking and throwing "the smooth stones from the brook" at the head of the modern boastful Goliath, and hitting the mark every time. The work was first published in *The Princeton Theological Review*, and is now issued in brochure form for wider circulation. We hope it will have a wide influence in America. Address Marshall Brothers, London or New York. Price, 6d.

* * *

"There are men who have remarkable powers of persuasion at an election, who yet say they cannot urge men to decision for Christ. If you have influenced a man to vote as he ought to vote for the good of his country, you should be able to win a man for Christ."—*G. Campbell Morgan.*

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles used in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at following rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 words to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NOTE—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible Champion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

FOR SALE—Complete set Homiletical Commentary on the Old Testament, 21 volumes, good as new condition. Cost \$60.00—will sell for \$20 cash. Address Homiletical, care Bible Champion Reading, Pa.

SALE—World's Parliament of Religions, new, 2 vols., morocco, \$3.00. Address J. K. L., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS — Universal Encyclopedia, 6 vols., cloth, cost \$15—for \$7.50; 6,000 Years of Church History, 10 vols., cloth, cost \$15.00—for \$7.50; Compendium Evangelical Theology, *Passmore*, cost \$3.00—for \$1.25; American Bookman, *Howe*, cost \$2.50—for \$1.25; Professing Christians, *Finney*, cost \$1.75—for \$1.00. All new from an unused library and tops show a bit of shelf exposure. Sent prepaid. Address, S. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FREE! Every pastor should know the vast growth of both kinds of Mormonism and how to meet conditions. Working outside of Utah they have 2,000 emissaries, and have 1,200 organizations. Get a Free Sample copy of *Light on Mormonism*, edited by Rev. J. D. Nutting, for 31 years missionary among Mormons. Subscription price is 25c a year, 10 or more copies at Club rate—14c per year. Post the town! Utah Gospel Mission, 9277 Amesbury Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. 4-2

FOR SALE — Letter Copying Press, perfect condition, like new, cost \$8.00, for \$2.50. Address, H. I. J., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED — Volume "The Resurrection," by West. Address, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—These books all cost \$1.50 each. Will sell any one for 75c, prepaid. Scientific Faith, *Johnston*; Paradoxical Pain, *Harbin*; Progress of Religious Freedom, *Schlaff*; The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible, *Burns*; Steps Unto Heaven, *Carpenter*; Gift of Mind to Spirit, *Kulaner*; Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter*; The Life that Really Is, *Abbott*. Address, N. O. P., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

BIBLE COMMENTARY—Just like new. Lange's on Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, James, Revelation. Will sell for \$1.50 any single vol., or \$10 for the 8 vols. Prepaid east of Rockies. Address P. R. S., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Lange's Commentary on Job, cloth, *Schaff*, cost \$3.00—for \$1.75; Greater Life Work of Christ, *Patterson*, cost \$1.50—75c; Old Testament Introduction, *Raven*, cost \$2.00, net—for \$1.25; Preacher Problems, *Moore*, cost \$1.50, net—for 90c; Getting One's Bearings, *McKenzie*, cost \$1.25, net—for 75c; The Fascination of the Book, cost \$1.25, net—for 75c; Unselfishness of God, *Smith*, cost \$1.25, net—for 75c. All sent prepaid. These are bargains. Address, A. A. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Vols. 1, 2, 3 Bible Student and Teacher—either bound or unbound. Name price and give condition. Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Copy of Dr. Gregory's "Why Four Gospels." Give conditions and price. Address Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE — NEW. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Ekholm*, (\$1.50) for 90c; Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, *Thorburn*, (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Christ, His Nature and Work, (\$1.75) for \$1.10; Up in Maine, 6th Ed., *Day*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Chat About Celebrities, *Guild*, (\$1.50) for 85c; Way of the Preacher, *Kern*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Revivals, How and When, *Newell*, (\$1.25) for 65c. Address, S. T. U., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Books like New. Figures in parenthesis show what they cost. Will mail any book prepaid for 50c. Romance of Providence, (\$1.50); Landmarks of the Evangelical Association, (\$1.50); S. S. Movement in America, (\$1.25); Science and Religion, (\$1.00); Nature and Culture, (\$1.00); How to Gesture, (\$1.00); Modern Cities, (\$1.00); Fifth Years, (\$1.00); Henry Boynton Smith, (\$1.00); Protestant Church in France, (\$1.25). Address, A. B. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

CHEAP NEW BOOKS—Artists and Arabs, cost 75c—for 40c; A Study in Pedagogy, cost 75c—for 40c; S. S. Normal Class, cost 50c—for 25c; Yet Speaking, cost 50c—for 30c; Life's Everydayness, cost 50c—for 30c; Good Tidings, cost 35c—for 20c; Environment, cost 25c—for 15c. Address, A. B. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP — Fundamentals and their Contrast, *Buckley*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Chosen of God, *Lathe*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Municipal Reform Movement, *Tolman*, (\$1.00) for 40c; Methods & Principles, *Winship*, (\$1.00) for 60c; The Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Return of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Return of the Lord Jesus, *Torrey*, (\$1.00) for 75c. All postpaid at price named. Address, M. N. O., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

SECOND-HAND BOOKS CHEAP — Prices in parenthesis are what books cost new. The Broken Seal, *Green*, (\$1.50) for 35c; *Hamilton's* Mexican Hand Book, Ills., (\$1.50) for 35c; Relations of the Republic and Laws of Religious Corporations, *Kynett*, (\$2.50) for 50c; Christ for India, *Lucas*, (\$2.00) for 50c; *Dewey's* Works, (\$2.50) for 75c. All fully worth price asked. All sent prepaid. Address, O. P. R., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

LIKE NEW BOOKS—Pronouncing Bible, sheep binding, with Books of Psalms in meter, \$1.25; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8 vo., \$1.00; Platform Echoes, *Gough*, 8 vo., \$1.00; The Old Way, *Rhoads* 50c. All like new, all prepaid. Address S. L. D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—All Matters Tend to Rotatio, *Hamilton*, (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Doubters and their Doubts, *Darling*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Sanctified Spice, *Peters*, (\$.75) for 40c; Pleasures of Literature and Solace of Books, *Shaylor* (\$.75) for 50c; The Listener in the Church, (35c) for 25c; *Wasson's* Religious, Social & Political Essays, (\$1.50) for 75c; Great Books as Life Teachers, *Hillis*, (\$1.50) for 75c; All prepaid. Address R. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Collapse of Evolution

By Dr. L. T. Townsend

The new and enlarged edition is now ready to mail.

A beautifully printed pamphlet, with bright, strong, cover, 64 pages. Orders for thousands of them were filled the first week they were off the press.

Dr. Townsend deals our Evolutionists a crushing blow. Get yours—and order a lot to give your friends.

Price 20c each; \$2.25 per dozen; \$17 per 100—Prepaid at these prices.

ALTAR AND RING

A Wedding-Day Souvenir

COMPILED BY G. B. F. HALLOCK, D.D.

There is nothing on the market to equal it at the price. A very pretty booklet, having an artistic, heavy, stiff, white cover, with a pretty up-to-date stamp in Aluminum. Printed on a very heavy enameled book paper and silver edged. Each book is packed in a box, for safe mailing and presentation. Size $6\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$.

This book is not a mere jumble of poetry, but has an idea running thru it; it begins with suggestions on courtship, then the ceremony, then the congratulations of friends, etc. The poems celebrating the all-important occasions appeal to heart and mind alike in words of tender sympathy and counsel for the newly-wedded pair.

READ THIS

I am much pleased with them; the arrangements are unique, and the selections are very appropriate.—*Rev. Edwin Genge.*

In sending a duplicate order for a dozen of ALTAR AND RING, a prominent minister says: "If ministers only knew what a beautiful book it is, they would go like hot cakes."

Single copy, 50 cents; 6 copies, \$2.50; 12 copies, \$5.00, prepaid. Your money back if you want it.

Other Booklet Wedding Day Souvenirs

BRIDAL SOUVENIR—A brief modern handbook on the relation of husband and wife, 86 pp., white cloth, beautiful gold and tint design, $6 \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ inches. Each in box, 60 cents. Special price, 50c net, postpaid.

THE WEDDING DAY, by Bishop John F. Hurst, D.D., cloth, 60c—special price, 50c. Beautifully bound in white cloth, white gilt edges. Size page, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7$. Gives the Service, the Marriage Certificate, and Words of Counsel. Yours, while they last, at 50c. prepaid.

25c Religious Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package of timely Religious Pamphlets fully 50c worth, and more! Try one!

CHURCH FURNITURE
Pews, Pulpits, Chairs, Altars, Book
Racks, Tables, Communion Ware—EVERY-
THING. The finest furniture made. Direct
from our factory to your church. Catalog free.
DeMoulin Bros. & Co., Dpt. 79, Greenville, Ill.



Typewriter Ribbon

Typewriter Carbon Paper

The Best Ribbon we know of at the price. High grade, non-filling, full length, permanent colors in any climate, perfect edge. Any writer using narrow ribbon, at 75c, prepaid.

The Best Carbon Paper we know of at the price—black, blue or purple. High grade, smooth and even.

25 sheet 60c; 50 sheet \$1.10; 100 sheet \$2. All prepaid.

Sermon Outlines

These Sermon Sketches are available not only for Revival Services, but also for the ordinary preparation for the pulpit. They are Suggestive, Helpful Fresh Gems, and will prove very valuable to ministers in their study.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by fifty different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price 50c

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

Are by Rev. Wm. J. Stevenson, D.D., singularly original, and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price 50c

Sketches of Funeral Sermons

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons for Funeral Occasions, contributed by fifty different ministers, like No. 4. It also contains fifty carefully selected Texts for Funeral Sermons, price 50c

Sketches of Sermons on the Lord's Prayer

By J. C. Hornberger, D.D. Price, 10c

The Tool Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Pegs of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc., gathered from various sources and grouped together in convenient form for the express purpose of helping to fix upon some suitable subject, thus affording assistance in time of need and emergency.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c

The Seed Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Seed Corns, etc., similar to Tool Basket.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c

"It deserves its name. Open it anywhere, and you will drop on an ingenious arrangement of a subject, a happily selected cluster of Scripture texts, or illustrations for lighting up an address."—Rev. F. B. Meyer.

"Admirable; the sort of thing that is invaluable to busy workers."—Rev. Mark Guy Pearse.

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Penna.